The Communist

20c FEBRUARY Copy A 1944

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
PLENARY MEETING ISSUE

TEHERAN AND AMERICA

PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL UNITY IN THE WAR AND THE POST-WAR

Earl Browder
Eugene Dennis • Robert Minor
John Williamson • Roy Hudson • Gil Green

Resolutions and Documents

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

V. I. LENIN: A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY

Prepared by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, this volume provides a new and authoritative study of the life and activities of the founder and leader of the Soviet Union up to the time of Lenin's death. **Price $1.90**

THE RED ARMY

By Prof. I. Minz

The history and organization of the Red Army and a record of its achievements from its foundation up to the epic victory at Stalingrad. **Price $1.25**

SOVIET ECONOMY AND THE WAR

By Maurice Dobb

A factual record of economic developments during the last few years with special reference to their bearing on the war potential and the needs of the war. **Price $.25**

SOVIET PLANNING AND LABOR IN PEACE AND WAR

By Maurice Dobb

A study of economic planning, the financial system, work, wages, the economic effects of the war, and other special aspects of the Soviet economic system prior to and during the war **Price $.35**

THE WAR OF NATIONAL LIBERATION (in two parts)

By Joseph Stalin

A collection of the wartime addresses of the Soviet Premier and Marshal of the Red Army, covering two years of the war against the Axis. **Price, each, $.15**

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXIII, NO. 2 FEBRUARY, 1944

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Statement to the Press by the National Committee of the Communist Party		99
Marxism Arms Communists to Meet and Solve Issues Today	*Earl Browder*	102
Decisions of the National Committee of the Communist Party		107
The Outlook for a Durable Peace	*Eugene Dennis*	109
Not "In Spite of" But *Because*	*Robert Minor*	122
New Problems of Communist Organization	*John Williamson*	131
Teheran and the Wage Policy Issue	*Roy Hudson*	140
American Capitalism and Teheran	*Gilbert Green*	148
George Washington—Patriot and Statesman	*Carl Ross*	153
Lenin and the Soviet People's Patriotic War	*Zinaida Smirnova*	163
Poland and the Coming Stage of the War	*Eugene Tarlé*	167
The Most Important Stage in the Development of Friendship Between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia		170
Forging Negro-White Unity	*John Pittman*	174
Historic Documents		182

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAMPHLETS ON THE WAR

Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, by Earl Browder	$.03
Jewish Unity For Victory, by Alexander Bittelman	.10
A Talk About the Communist Party, by Earl Browder	.03
The Path Dimitroff Charted, by V. J. Jerome	.05
Soviet Democracy and the War, by William Z. Foster	.05
George Dimitroff, with introduction by Earl Browder	.10
The Soviet Union—A Family of Nations	.10
Organized Labor in the Soviet Union, by Edwin S. Smith	.10
Drama in Wartime Russia, by H. W. L. Dana	.15
Soviet Trade Unions and Allied Labor Unity by William Z. Foster	.05

Teheran and America

By EARL BROWDER

Report to the Plenary Meeting of the National Committee, Communist Party January 7, 1944.

Price Five Cents

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

[*This issue of* The Communist *is in its major part devoted to the proceedings of the plenary meeting of the National Committee, Communist Party U.S.A., held in New York on January 7, 8 and 9, 1944. Included are the National Committee Statement issued to the press; the summation speech of the General Secretary, Earl Browder; excerpts from the speeches of Comrades Dennis, Minor, Williamson, Hudson, and Green; and the unanimously adopted decisions of the National Committee. The report given by Comrade Browder, in behalf of the Political Committee, was published in full in the* Worker *of January 16, 1944, and is now also available in pamphlet form, under the title* Teheran and America, *published by Workers Library Publishers, New York. This report reviews, in the light of the Moscow-Cairo-Teheran Agreements, the role and obligation of our nation and its working class, in the winning of the war and in the establishment of an orderly and peaceful post-war world. Close study, full understanding and wide popularization of the report, and the National Committee Plenum discussion and decisions, based thereon, are essential for the strengthening of national unity, for a win-the-war victory in the 1944 elections, and in meeting the many complex wartime and post-war problems of the U.S.A. The March issue will contain further speeches by Communist leaders at the National Committee meeting, including the addresses of Comrades James W. Ford and Rose Wortis.—The Editors.*]

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY *

AN UNPRECEDENTED situation in the world and within our country has been created by the favorable course of the military action and by the international agreements of the United Nations coalition which assure victory in the war and the outlook for a long period of world peace and orderly post-war reconstruction.

The defeat of the Axis, the smashing of the Hitler and Quisling regimes and their replacement by democracies in continental Europe will fundamentally and favorably alter the prospect for the future, while the destruction of the imperialist regime of Japan will still

* Adopted unanimously by the National Committee on January 9, 1944, at the concluding session of its Plenary Meeting, on the Report of Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communits Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

further release the forces of national liberation and democracy of the peoples of Asia.

The Moscow, Teheran and Cairo agreements give a program to banish the specter of civil wars and war between nations for several generations.

Not only a prolonged world peace without precedent in history, but also a flourishing of economic relationships of cooperation and a development of economic well-being and social reforms, is the prospect open for the world.

Within our country the extension of the United Nations coalition into the post-war period of reconstruction provides the basis for the successful reconversion of our industrial plant, enormously expanded in war production, to normal operation—to the benefit of labor, the farmers and capital. For labor the program calls for full employment and orderly social progress through the instruments of collective bargaining and the reform and full use of the democratic political machinery under our Constitution.

The Moscow and Teheran agreements enable our government to carry out a policy of international accord in respect to world agricultural prices and marketing and therefore an effective national responsibility for sound economy in agriculture. A farm economy of abundance, with capacity production for the post-war rehabilitation under arrangements made by our government, banishes the specter of a return to an enforced scarcity, unprotected income, foreclosures and agricultural ruin.

* * *

It is beyond question that the post-war reconstruction, like production for the war at present, will be carried out under the system of free enterprise.

The Communist Party commits itself in full good faith to work with the overwhelming majority of our nation for the most successful realization of our enormous national task of war and post-war construction on this basis.

It is equally evident that the political issues of this time will be decided within the form of the two-party system traditional in our country. In this framework can be fought out and won the necessary struggle of the American people to safeguard our country's victory and the preservation of its institutions through such measures as the restoration of universal suffrage to the Southern people, the elimination of anti-Negro and all other undemocratic restrictions in the primary elections, and a total removal of all anti-labor laws and racial discrimination.

The Communist Party's contribution in the election will be to aid the struggle for the unity of the people in support of the nation's war policies, without partisan or class advantages.

The win-the-war policies of the nation are under challenge in this election. A rejection by the people of all defeatist attacks on the President's and the nation's war policy is an inseparable part of the successful and speedy victorious conclusion of the war. The national

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

election of 1944 is as much a test of the people's support of the war as was the election of 1864.

The war is not yet won. The really decisive fighting lies ahead. The Communist Party places ahead of all other considerations the consolidation of our national unity to guarantee the speediest victorious conclusion of the war in Europe and Asia, uninterrupted and full war production, and the consolidation of the peace and collaboration between nations which the agreements have made possible.

The National Committee calls a National Convention of the Communist Party to meet in May, the day and place to be fixed by the Political Committee by February 1. Before this Convention the National Committee will place a number of proposals, among which will be that the Communist organization cease to carry the word "Party" in its name, and, instead, adopt a name more exactly representing its role as a part of a larger unity in the nation, not seeking any partisan advancement—a name, for example, like "American Communist Political Association."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARXISM ARMS COMMUNISTS TO MEET AND SOLVE ISSUES TODAY *

BY EARL BROWDER

FOR the first time we are meeting and solving problems for which there are no precedents in history and no formulas from the classics which give us the answer. Perhaps we could say that our party is fully standing on its own feet for the first time. We are seeking the answers to this new period in what, I think, we are all convinced is the right direction; and we are confident that we are really getting our fingers into these problems and beginning to control them. It seems to me that at this Plenum we have demonstrated the highest stage of maturity that our party has ever reached.

I was especially pleased with Bob Minor's contribution to the discussion because it was a living example of how to make use of the classics of Marxism for the new period, without falling into formulas and the searching for formulas.

I think we must emphasize more than ever the tremendous value of the classics of Marxism in arming ourselves to meet and solve the new and unprecedented problems. Marxism never was a series of dogmas and formulas; it never was a catalogue of prohibitions listing the things we must not do irrespective of new developments and new situations; it does not tell us that things cannot be done; it tells us how *to do* the things that have to be done, the things that history has posed as necessary and indispensable tasks. Marxism is a theory of deeds, not of don'ts. Marxism is therefore a positive, dynamic, creative force, and it is such a great socal power precisely because, as a scientific outlook and method, it takes living realities as its starting point. It has always regarded the scientific knowledge of the past as a basis for meeting the new and unprecedented problems of the present and the future. And the largest problems today are new in a very basic sense.

We have more than ever the task to refresh ourselves in the great tradition of Marxism, completely freeing ourselves from the last remnants of the dogmatic and schematic approach. Marxism is the science of the transition to socialism.

It was Marx and Engels who

* Concluding remarks at the close of the meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, January 9, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transformed socialism from a utopia into a science, from an inspiring dream—grounded only in the desire for a better life—into a mighty movement powered by the material and objective necessities of social development. That transformation from utopianism has a lesson we have to relearn today in the light of the new world situation. Basically, that lesson is that socialism arises out of the development of existing society which creates certain necessities that ultimately press the great masses of people to take the path of socialism. These necessities exist independently of our thinking, but when we understand how the process works we can greatly facilitate and speed it up. In fact, our understanding and our thinking become a great and decisive factor in turning what history has made objectively possible into actual reality, but our thinking is never an independent factor; and by thinking alone we cannot change the course of history. We can guide the course of history only if we understand the basic forces of history that exist outside of our own minds.

We have to be humble and learn from history; we have to learn from facts and never try to impose our preconceptions upon history. That is one of the first lessons of Marxism, which we have to relearn afresh if we are to make the fullest possible use of this tremendous intellectual arsenal that has been given to us by the great thinkers and leaders of the Socialist-Communist movement. We cannot rise to the heights that are necessary to master this historical moment through intellectual arrogance. We must be prepared to refresh ourselves according to the necessities of the period into which history has brought us, and, above all, we must understand that history never yet has been known to follow anyone's private blueprint. The great turning points of history are in this sense always unexpected; there is always something new, something fresh in them that has to be fundamentally evaluated. We are in such a period today.

This requires from everyone who aspires to leading functions a deep feeling of responsibility, personal responsibility for the successful conduct of the smallest tasks of the daily work such as the successful conclusion of our recruiting drive, for example, but above all, it requires intellectual responsibility, the responsibility for each one of us individually to think through and master these problems.

Fortunately even these new things in history do not present themselves unannounced; almost always they knock on the door before they come in. That is why we were not entirely unprepared in this Plenum for the decisions that we are making, unprecedented as these decisions are. True, according to all of the text books of the past, we are departing from orthodoxy, because none of our text books foresaw or predicted a long period of peaceful relations in the world before the general advent of socialism. But now we are setting our course to realize the possibilities inherent in the present situation of what would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been described in the past as an evolutionary development of the transition period — provided, of course, that we can successfully meet our responsibilities.

This is possible because the price in blood and struggle has been paid in advance in this terrific war, and because we already have a firm bastion and fortress of socialism established in the Soviet Union during twenty-six years of the most heroic and intelligent construction which the history of humanity has ever recorded.

We are not prepared to give any broad theoretical generalizations for this period. But we know, as we go into it boldly, without the slightest hesitation, that we are firmly guided by the theoretical heritage of Marxism and that the Teheran Declaration which was signed by Churchill, Roosevelt and the great Marxist Stalin represents the only program in the interest of the toiling masses of the whole world in the next period. We could not do more than give general intimations of the possibilities of such a period. We could not unconditionally throw our forces into this new period while it was still merely a possibility, but now that this possibility has been confirmed by the agreement of Teheran, we know we can feel absolutely certain that we have crossed the border-line from the past and have definitely entered the present.

When we speak of the Teheran agreement we must understand that it was an agreement among the ruling classes of three great powerful countries who today hold an almost complete monopoly of military power in the world and an overwhelming preponderance of economic power. The power behind that combination comes from its permanence, because if it would not be permanent it would not be powerful. The power of that combination can only be fully realized when we begin to study what are the alternatives to it. Many estimable gentlemen today are lightheartedly taking potshots at the Teheran agreement. But I venture to predict that they will be changing their tune, because they will begin to face the alternative to Teheran; and if they don't face it, history will begin to rub their noses into the problem and make them face it.

Imagine the problems facing the United States without the Teheran agreement. American economy has been expanded to a scale beyond the wildest dreams of any American capitalist. The American bourgeoisie today is in possession of the effective control and direction of such enormous productive powers that their imaginations cannot encompass it. Some of them have had their minds turned as a result of this power and the product is the fantasies of the "Luce-thinking" school. But what are all the fantasies of this "Luce-thinking" school worth unless they are brought down to earth and harnessed to the Teheran agreement? They will all explode from their own internal contradictions unless they are harnessed to serve the cause of world progress, harnessed in the combination of Teheran. And without Teheran the catastrophe that would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come upon us and the rest of the world would be all the more certain and complete. These hard facts are the material guarantee behind the Teheran pact.

Our confidence in this Agreement is buttressed not only in our high opinion of each of the three great men who brought this pact into being, but first of all in an understanding and knowledge, that there is no other way for the world and that there is still intelligence enough left in America, despite our newspapers, to guarantee that our country will not rush headlong and blindly over the precipice of disaster that is the only alternative to Teheran. With that confidence, we can be completely sure of our course.

Our course is not easy and it will require political struggles for which we will have to find ever new means and forms; but these must be struggles for unity in the nation, not struggles which will break that unity; struggles against the enemies of unity and for uniting everyone who recognizes even indistinctly, but enough to take the first steps, the need of going along the road of the Teheran Conference.

We are not in our new course entering any other party. The Communists are not joining the Democratic Party; the Communists are not joining the Republican Party. We are not endorsing either of the major parties, and we are not condemning either of the major parties. We are taking the line of issues and not of parties and of choosing men as they stand for or against issues without regard to party labels. This was one of the biggest arguments I developed in my book *Victory—And After*. When I say that we are not entering parties or not endorsing parties, I don't mean we have any objections to our individual members registering in one or the other of the parties when their local community life calls for it and their associates and fellows are following that course. But I mean that the Communist movement and our organization is not committed to any party label or any party organization.

We are independent, in the same way as the great bulk of America's independent voters who make up fully one-third of the total voting strength of the country and who are not committed to either of the major parties, though most of them are registered with one or the other. As a part of this independent voters' group, we may find our members registering wherever they think will best advance the progressive cause. That is one of the rights of citizenship and our organization would not think of denying to any American the full exercise of all his rights as an American citizen. But our organization is not and will not be an organization committed to any party; and that is necessarily the case because of the nature of the two major parties. These two parties are essentially institutionalized channels, semi-governmental in their nature, through which the citizenry groups and regroups itself from election to election according to the leadership that is thrown up

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the issues that are thereby developed.

In the general relationship of forces in the country, for us there can be no commitment to party because that would be to commit ourselves to an institutionalized structure which stands for nothing in particular in the political sense. Therefore we have to concentrate our attention exclusively on issues, and on men who represent issues within the various party structures, and choose freely among them on their merits without regard to party label.

This is the major point that I thought necessary to bring forward in these summary remarks, as a sort of continuation of the discussion, because it seems to me that while there is general acceptance of the course on which we are going, there is perhaps not the same complete and general understanding that this new course is not in any way an identification with any of the old party structures. If we are identifying ourselves with any general, big political grouping in the country, in the narrower electoral sense, it is with the great body of independent voters of America who in the electoral struggle will choose whom they support on the basis of their judgment of the character of men and of the issues for which they stand, and nothing else.

I have the general feeling that in these three days we have welded together such a common body of opinion so firmly grounded in our own experience, in the objective reality of the world outside, and in our capacity to understand—a collective capacity which is our great strength—that we can go from this meeting of the National Committee with a greater confidence than ever before that we will meet and solve the problems facing us with honor to our great movement, to our organization and with a full meeting of our responsibilities to the nation and to the working class.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DECISIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON JANUARY 9, 1944, AT THE FINAL SESSION OF ITS PLENARY MEETING

1. THE National Committee endorses the report of its General Secretary, Earl Browder. It fully approves the estimate of the report on the historic Teheran Conference, the perspectives outlined for the next period ahead, and the policies set forth, especially the key task of strengthening national unity to speed victory in the war and in the crucial 1944 elections, and for creating the most favorable situation within the country to help realize the aims and accords of the Teheran Conference in the post-war period. It likewise concurs in the recommendation to submit to the next National Convention of the party the proposal to change the name and electoral status of the Communist Party, to something like that of "American Communist Political Association."

2. The National Committee decides to convene a National Convention during May, 1944. It directs the Political Committee to set the date and place of the Convention and to issue the Convention Call by February 1, and to establish such commissions as may be necessary to prepare for the Convention. It proposes that Comrade Browder's report to this meeting of the National Committee shall be the basis for the pre-Convention discussion. It further decides to form now a Committee on Constitution, to submit recommendations on possible changes in the Preamble, name, Articles and Sections of our Constitution, to the National Convention. This committee shall be composed of: Roy Hudson, Chairman; John Williamson, Secretary; Gilbert Green, Eugene Dennis, Ann Burlak, Pat Toohey, Sam Darcy, Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Ben Gold, Peter Cacchione.

3. The National Committee elects a Communist National Election and Political Action Committee. This committee shall be: Earl Browder, Chairman; Eugene Dennis, Secretary; William Z. Foster, Robert Minor, James W. Ford, Roy Hudson, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Gilbert Green, John Williamson, Morris Childs, William Schneiderman, Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Peter Cacchione, Arnold Johnson and Alice Burke.

(a) The Executive Committee of the National Election and Political Action Committee shall be: Earl

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Browder, Eugene Dennis, Gilbert Green, Morris Childs, William Schneiderman. The National Election and Political Action Committee is empowered to enlarge the committee with additional members.

4. The National Committee appoints the following committee to help develop special activities and a publishing program, and generally to guide the preparations for the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the founding of the American Communist Party: William Z. Foster, Chairman; Robert Minor, Secretary; James W. Ford, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Israel Amter, Rose Wortis, Ray Hansbrough, Steve Nelson, Max Weiss, Louis Todd, Sam Don, A. Trachtenberg, A. Landy, John Williamson, Mother Bloor, Anita Whitney, Charles Krumbein, Rob Hall, Pettis Perry, A. Wagenknecht, V. J. Jerome.

5. The National Committee sends warm fraternal greetings to the *Daily Worker* on the occasion of its Twentieth Anniversary. It directs the Political Committee and the State Committees to work out ways and means immediately to help extend the circulation and influence of the *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker*—these invaluable instruments of Marxist working class education and organization which consistently champion the vital interests of labor, the people and the nation.

6. The National Committee approves the recommendations of the Political Committee and the State Committees to organize a national recruiting drive from February 12 to May 1, and calls upon the party membership and organizations to resolutely support and carry through the objectives of this campaign which can help strengthen our national unity and war effort.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OUTLOOK FOR A DURABLE PEACE

BY EUGENE DENNIS

PRECISELY now as the prospects for defeating Hitler Germany draw nearer, the American people seriously and ever more frequently ask: What steps must be taken today to insure that after victory over Hitler and the Axis there shall be created a firm and lasting peace?

This is no academic, not even a post-war question. It is inseparably connected with the major problems of winning the war and the 1944 elections. Here it should be noted that most of the defeatist and appeasement forces who are cautious in directly opposing the military decisions of Teheran are boldly and demagogically trying to distort, belittle and discredit the agreements reached by the American-Soviet-British coalition for organizing post-war peace and security. They are doing this in order to create dissension, so as to hinder the invasion of Europe, to prolong the war, to obstruct national unity in the elections and to create division among the United Nations.

One of the great historic achievements of the Teheran Conference, as Comrade Browder has stressed in his masterly report, is that it gave an affirmative answer to the vital question as to whether the United Nations and peoples can secure a prolonged peace, as well as win the war. The Declaration of Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill expressed the confidence of the three leading anti-Hitler powers that it is possible to banish the scourge of war for many generations to come. And the Teheran Conference buttressed this determination with united action and accord on the cardinal issues of war and peace.

In what respects did the Teheran Conference, together with its predecessor in Moscow, lay the basis for securing a just and durable peace?

First and of decisive importance is the crucial decision made at Teheran by the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain to achieve a completely unified military strategy and concerted military action, to coordinate the great offensives of the Red Army from the east with a powerful Anglo-American attack from the west and the south. This is embodied in the "complete agreement" reached "as to the scope and timing of military operations to be undertaken from the east, west and south." This central decision solved the most difficult question in any coalition war, and the most difficult question affecting the relations of the Allies, namely, the organization

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of joint military blows against the common enemy. It blasted the last hope of the Hitlerites, the hope of prolonging the war and thereby sowing disunity within the anti-Hitler coalition. This decision ensures that the military destruction of the Hitlerites and the Axis is guaranteed and hastened.

Second: Upon the basis of the combined military efforts to accelerate victory over Hitler-Germany, the Teheran Conference opened the way for a new period of friendly and peaceful cooperation of America, the Soviet Union and Great Britain in the post-war period. It established agreement and concord for developing common action and close collaboration of the Three Powers, not only during the war, but also for creating an alliance and an international organization for maintaining world peace and security, for checking and preventing the recurrence of aggression on the part of Germany and its accomplices, for promoting the freedom and independence of all peoples, and for cooperating in solving the problems of economic reconstruction. It drew one of the main lessons arising from the past post-war period of 1918 to 1939, including the fate of the League of Nations. It recognized that no system of international security is possible without guaranteeing the closest unity of the leading peace-loving powers, in the first place of the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain. It recognized that the preservation of this unity and collective security is indispensable for attaining a firm and lasting peace.

Third: The Teheran Conference further establishes the basis for realizing a lasting peace because, unlike the agreements reached by the major victorious powers after the First World War, the Three Powers declaration proposes to bring about the collaboration of all countries, large and small, whose people are dedicated to the common task of eliminating tyranny, slavery, oppression and intolerance. And this pledge of the "Big Three" already has been reinforced by the consummation of the Soviet-Czech Mutual Assistance Pact and by the accords reached on Yugoslavia and Italy. Instead of a "dictatorship of the great powers" as the Hitlerites and their agents charge, and instead of an Anglo-American alliance for world hegemony as projected by Messrs. Hoover and Luce, the concord of the anti-Hitler coalition is directed toward achieving a family of democratic states. The leading positions of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and China in international affairs will now be joined to prevent the world domination of any power or powers and to promote world peace and the independence and security of the nations.

Fourth: The prospects for a lasting peace are also real because the decisions of the Teheran and Moscow Conferences make possible that Europe will arise independent and democratic from the barbaric enslavement to which it has been reduced by Hitlerism and Hitler's "New Order." The victory of the anti-Hitler coalition over Nazism-fascism will simultaneously expe-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dite the destruction of the reactionary factors of pre-war European policy, of those factors which inevitably led to the bloodiest and most devastating of all wars: World War II. Europe will be revived on soil purged of fascism. In the new Europe the decisive word will not belong to the pro-fascist and anti-national regimes which serve as the accomplices of fascism, reaction and aggression. It will belong to the peoples, as evidenced by the course of developments in Yugoslavia, France and Italy. This, too, is another factor heralding the conditions for realizing a durable peace.

These then are some of the basic factors and considerations flowing out of the decisions and concords of the Teheran and Moscow Conferences, and the military-political developments which have taken place in the course of the war, and which justify the conclusion that conditions have now been created to bring about a just and lasting peace.

But some people may raise the question: how is it possible, from a Marxist viewpoint, to speak of an enduring peace under conditions in which capitalism holds sway in five-sixths of the world? And they ask, what about the well-known Leninist thesis that wars cannot be abolished under capitalism? What about the proposition that in its monopoly phase, in the epoch of imperialism, the contradictions of capitalism inevitably lead to and result in crises and wars?

From the point of view of the science of the working class, of Marxism-Leninism, it is true that in modern society, with all its contradictions, there neither are nor can be any *absolute* guarantee against the outbreak of wars.

But from this correct theoretical conclusion we Communists never adopted a fatalistic or a passive position. Even in a different period, and with an entirely different relationship of world forces, we always waged a resolute struggle to check and prevent aggression. And if our policy to achieve collective security of the democratic powers, particularly of the United States and the U.S.S.R., and a united working class and people's front against fascism and war, had prevailed in the pre-war period, especially in the years from 1933 to 1939, this war, the Second World War, could have been averted. Or at least, the fascist aggressors would have long since been smashed and the world spared the devastating experience of Hitler's bloodbath and "New Order."

Today, and within the framework of the social conditions and international relations that are emerging from this people's war of national liberation, *the conditions are being forged as in no previous period of history to realize a prolonged, a lasting peace. For on the basis of the fighting alliance and consolidation of the American-Soviet-British coalition, on the basis of winning victory over the Hitlerite regime and Axis—a new historical situation is being created.* Now and after victory it will be possible to secure an effective alliance and measures to avert or restrict the danger of war, to estab-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lish collective security so as to hinder the hands of all possible aggressors, and to make difficult, if not stop, aggression and military conflicts. In other words, it is possible to achieve this on the basis of supporting and implementing the decisions and accords of the Teheran and Moscow Conferences, on the basis of continuing and strengthening the friendship and the closest cooperation of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain in the war and the peace.

Moreover, the achievement of a lasting peace is also possible because in the new international situation which is taking shape, the most consistent fighter for world peace, the U.S.S.R., emerges as the greatest land power and as a more influential world factor. It is possible because the new Europe, while emerging largely non-Socialist, will be democratic and anti-fascist and a more effective force for establishing and maintaining collective security. It is possible because of the growing solidarity of the international labor movement. It is possible because the collaboration of our government, and the friendship between the American and Soviet peoples, as between the British and Soviet peoples, has been reinforced during the war. It is possible because the alignment of class forces within the U.S.A., favoring the consolidation and continuation of the American-Soviet-British coalition, among both labor and bourgeois circles, has been strengthened. It is possible because the smashing of Hitlerism will strengthen the democratic and progressive forces in the United States and everywhere.

Furthermore, it is not only possible, *it is also absolutely necessary,* to establish an enduring peace for many generations. The fate of world civilization requires a protracted period of peaceful relations and international cooperation of the anti-Hitler coalition and all other freedom-loving nations. For one thing, the healing of the devastation and wounds of the present global war, which are unprecedented in scope and destruction, requires a stable period of world relations in which there will be peace, security and order.

This is true for all nations, including the great democratic powers heading the United Nations. For instance, the powerful socialist state, the Soviet Union, which is emerging from the war with the strongest social system, and which has strengthened its friendly ties with its allies, needs and seeks, now as before, peaceful world relations to carry through the reconstruction of its devastated areas and the uninterrupted building of socialism within the country.

Great Britain, after the strains of five years of war, with its far-flung empire and economic interests, especially requires a post-war period in which there will be a durable peace and stable world relations. The United States, the strongest capitalist country, with great economic power, requires a durable peace no less than its allies. Among other things, America—including the dominant sections of the bourgeoisie—is vitally interested in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creating peaceful international relationships, since this will be decisive for enabling our country to overcome serious internal problems and to develop most favorably and extensively foreign trade, commerce and capital investments, and on a scale far surpassing the pre-war period. Thus, the vital interests of the leading anti-Hitler states, including the profound peace-loving aspirations of the peoples, makes it both necessary and possible to secure a democratic coalition of all class forces within the country and international collaboration for the organization of post-war peace and security.

These, in brief, are some of the reasons and factors that enable us, as Communists, to raise as a realistic probability the prospects for establishing a durable peace after the war.

Obviously, a lasting peace will not come of itself. The consolidation of the anti-Hitler coalition and the decision to open the Second Front required a most serious and stubborn political struggle, a struggle in which our party played an honorable and influential role. Great and persistent efforts will have to be made by *all* patriotic and anti-fascist forces within the United States, especially by organized labor, to insure the most rapid fulfillment of the decisions and objectives of the Teheran Conference. A more resolute and relentless struggle will have to be waged by the government and the entire democratic camp against all reactionary obstructionists, pro-fascists, and plotters of a "negotiated peace."

It is precisely from this viewpoint that the outcome of the coming Presidential and Congressional elections assumes such great and far-reaching importance. For unquestionably the results of the 1944 elections will markedly influence the relationship of forces within the country, which in turn will greatly determine the extent and tempo with which the United States will carry through the agreements and concords made at Moscow and Teheran.

* * *

What is essential now to guarantee victory in the elections, to ensure that the President continues at the helm of the government, and to bring about the election of a Congress composed of a coalition of win the-war representatives who will loyally and energetically back up and implement the policies formulated and adopted by the Government at the Teheran and Moscow Conferences—is to reinforce national unity for the most rapid conclusion of the war and for creating the most favorable internal relationships for organizing post-war peace and security.

Clearly, the problem of strengthening national unity in the heat of the election campaign and during the final stage of the war, is a most formidable task. Vested partisan interests and the operations of the two-party system would complicate the situation under the best of circumstances. But added to the "normal" difficulties of inter- and intra-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partisan strife, and accentuating these, are more serious factors which threaten the unity and future of the nation.

For in these decisive wartime elections, the most reactionary and appeasement sections of the monopolists, represented by the du Ponts, Pews and Fords, the Hearsts, McCormicks and Pattersons, are not engaging merely in partisan politics. They are out to disrupt the national war effort, to reverse the Teheran decisions and to supplant the Roosevelt Administration with a pro-fascist government.

And no one should minimize their strength and cunning. For these circles of finance capital dominate the Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg wing of the Republican Party and the Wheeler-Chandler wing of the Democratic Party. They are the driving force behind the reactionary anti-Administration bloc in Congress. They control a powerful defeatist press. They have high-placed agents in the labor and farm movements, like Lewis, Woll and Hutcheson, and the hierarchy in the Farm Bloc. Moreover, they have their special extra-parliamentary groups like the America First Party.

When to this situation are added the current strains between labor and the Administration on the issue of wage policy, the continuing division within the labor movement, the weak ties between the trade unions and the non-labor sections of the population, and the hesitancy and inconsistency with which many political leaders face and fight for the central war and post-war issues, it is clear that a gigantic and stubborn political struggle must still be waged to consolidate national unity around the Commander-in-Chief for speeding victory and for guaranteeing success for the win-the-war forces in the elections.

Notwithstanding these negative factors, it must also be realized that the conditions are favorable for effectively altering the situation, for overcoming these threats to the national war effort and the outcome of the elections.

First of all, the appeasement circles of Big Business are not the dominant political section of finance capital. Although they have great strength in Congress they do not control the government nor guide the destiny of the nation. And the developments in the war, the changed international relationships which have strengthened the American-Soviet-British coalition and brought Hitler and the Axis to the verge of defeat, are undermining and weakening their *internal* position and influence, which, however, they will seek to retain with increasing desperateness.

As a result of the epic Tri-Power Conferences, the former contradictions, distortions and confusions in the Government's anti-Axis policies in many respects have been largely overcome. The Government's foreign policy has been clarified and molded, and the majority within the country supporting the Government's policies has now been considerably increased among all sections of the population. Within the Democratic Party—the leading governmental party—the support for a fourth term has become almost uni-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

versal. And the action of the President in bolding raising the banner of Win-the-War in place of the obsolete New Deal label as the slogan of action of the national administration, is not merely a de jure recognition of a de facto situation. It helps to clarify the vital issues in the elections and indicates that the Roosevelt Administration will endeavor to broaden the national victory coalition within and around the Government. As for the Republican Party, there is a promising political development in the fact that the Hoover-Landon combination is being seriously challenged by the influential win-the-war forces represented by Lamont and the *New York Herald Tribune*.

Further, the popular support for the Commander-in-Chief remains at a high level, as revealed in the latest Gallup and *Fortune* polls. And now with the direct intervention of the President in helping to solve the wage problem and in pressing anew for subsidies and other measures to prevent inflation and a further rise in living costs, it will be possible to reinforce the alliance between labor and the Government. Certainly, the existing dissatisfaction in labor's ranks over certain domestic policies of the Administration has not resulted in any rifts that cannot and will not be overcome on the basis of supporting and constructively influencing the Administration, by firmly applying the general policies of the C.I.O., and by extending the political influence and mass work of our own party. Moreover, and of the utmost importance, despite all slowness and delays in developing labor's political action, it is a fact that the mass organizations and political influence of labor and the people have been strengthened during the war. The main trend in the labor movement, especially on the part of the C.I.O., is toward greater independent political action in collaboration with other patriotic groups and forces, especially with the Negro people and various nationality groups.

But to guarantee victory in the elections, reliance upon these and other positive factors and trends is not enough. *National unity must be organized, and organized around the key issues of winning the war and the peace.* And this requires, among other things, that it is necessary to work out flexible tactics and to single out those vital issues around which it will be possible to develop the broadest and most active support for the Commander-in-Chief and the win-the-war measures of the Government, for defeating and combating the pro-fascists, for advancing the unity of action of labor and all progressive forces, for influencing and implementing governmental policy, and for consolidating the alliance between the Government, labor and other sections of the democratic, win-the-war camp.

This means, for instance, that it is essential to popularize and explain, and to organize the widest non-partisan mass support to realize the all-decisive decisions and aims of the Teheran and Moscow Conferences. In this connection, it is imperative to explain the importance of Teheran, concretely, in terms of what this means for Amer-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ica; in terms of guaranteeing and speeding victory and saving American lives; in terms of safeguarding America's and world peace and thereby the next generations of America's youth; in terms of foreign trade and commerce, for facilitating economic prosperity for American industry, agriculture and labor.

It is also necessary to show that formal endorsement of the Moscow and Teheran Conferences is not sufficient, even, for instance, if the Republican Party were to adopt an identical plank on foreign policy with that of the Democratic Party. It is necessary to show that a mere vote for a Connolly resolution on the post-war organization of peace is not decisive in itself, particularly if the vote is cast by a Taft, a Wheeler, a Nye or by any other person who opposes the Government's war program. It is necessary to show that partisan criticism and sniping, as well as outright defeatist opposition to the agreements of Teheran, will not be tolerated, not even when employed by a Mr. Willkie.

Above all, what is essential is to *crystallize* labor's and the nation's support for the policies adopted at Teheran—a support which already embraces the majority of all classes within the country—to organize this into effective action, into resolute support of the Government's war program, into total war mobilization for successfully carrying through the crucial Anglo-American military offensives now being launched, and faithfully to honor the commitments of our Government for organizing, jointly with the Soviet Union and Great Britain, post-war peace and security. Likewise, it is necessary to show how the historic results of Teheran were facilitated and influenced by the foreign policy and anti-Hitler orientation of the Roosevelt Administration, and to make clear, on this basis, how vital it is to continue Roosevelt's leadership at the head of the nation.

To strengthen national unity also means that it is necessary to approach and finally solve the pressing wartime problems of economic stabilization, not from the angle of isolated problems and grievances, *but from the viewpoint of the entire war economy and national welfare.* In this connection, on the acute problems of wage policy, it is necessary to press not only for immediate wage adjustments, for adequate food subsidies and effective price controls—it is also urgent to bring about some formula and system for automatically and periodically raising wages and salaries commensurate with each rise in the cost of living. Moreover, in the fight for a sound stabilization program, which is vital for the entire country and national unity, both for wartime and during the whole reconversion period, it is necessary that labor make clear the responsibility of the majority in Congress for sabotaging the President's economic stabilization program. Above all, it is essential that labor come forward in defense of the needs of all consumers and independent producers, especially in behalf of the Government, professional and white collar employees. This is imperative

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for helping to solve the urgent economic problems affecting the masses as well as war production, and for strengthening the bonds between labor and the middle classes, and thereby the entire national win-the-war coalition.

Another question around which it will be possible to forge broad unity of action and cut across partisan lines is those problems and issues directly affecting the men in the armed forces and their dependents, *i.e.*, the issues of the soldiers' vote, mustering-out pay, rehabilitation and educational aid, social security and re-employment. Here, great attention should be given to reaching and organizing the women—the mothers, wives and sweethearts—as well as to bring about common action around these issues by the trade unions, the farm groups and women's and the veterans' organizations.

Likewise, increasing attention now has to be devoted to the complex and mounting problems of reconversion and renegotiation of war contracts, particularly as these affect post-war production and employment. For these questions are bound to multiply in importance and will play quite a role in the elections and on all post-war alignments within the nation.

As outlined by Comrade Browder, our approach to these questions must be governed in the first place by the basic considerations of strengthening national unity now *and* in the post-war period. This means to work out ways and means to solve these problems along the line of guaranteeing uninterrupted and maximum war production, of protecting the rights of labor and collective bargaining, of securing the fullest utilization of the private enterprise system to solve the problems of post-war production and employment, and to limit government regulation and intervention in the economy to cope mainly with anti-national monopolistic restraints and with those problems of unemployment which industry is unable to solve.

It is around these and similar issues that it will be possible to fortify national unity in these fateful wartime elections, especially the common action of labor. It will be possible to do this if a more systematic effort is made to *organize the win-the-war coalition;* to organize conferences, discussions, meetings and broader mass movements around specific events and policies, such as the Teheran Conference and the President's message to Congress, as well as around such legislative issues as the soldiers' vote and subsidies, the anti-poll tax and the Wagner-Dingell social security bills. It will be possible to do this if labor organizes to participate energetically in the current primary elections, both for the purposes of influencing and cooperating in the selection and election of win-the-war candidates, as well as for securing the election of precinct, county and state committeemen of a comparable character. This will make electoral organizations more representative of the win-the-war coalition and more responsive to the will of the labor and popular forces. It will be possible to do this if la-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bor, particularly its progressive sections, displays greater efforts and initiative in advancing the work and program of the C.I.O. Political Action Committee, in promoting various forms of joint and parallel C.I.O.-A. F. of L.-Brotherhood political action, and in concentrating on organizing labor's political machinery and activity in the most decisive industrial and working class communities and precincts. It will be possible to do this if labor establishes closer and many-sided cooperative relations with the Negro people and the patriotic and most progressive groups and leaders among the farmers, the churches and nationality groups, and the veterans' and women's organizations.

Furthermore, to facilitate victory in the elections and the war, and to create the most favorable internal conditions for securing a durable peace, it is likewise necessary, as Comrade Browder has emphasized, for American labor to extend and pursue a policy to develop national unity in the post-war period, as well as during the war. Under present international and social conditions, with the given relation of close forces in the United States, it is *desirable, necessary* and *possible* to organize national unity after the war based on the united action of labor and all other progressive forces, working in collaboration with the non-fascist sections of the bourgeoisie.

It is *possible* to do this on the basis of common support for the aims and accords of the Teheran Conference, of common agreement to organize and maintain world peace and security, to promote economic cooperation and trade for post-war reconstruction, to preserve and improve America's democratic institutions and liberties, and to expand production and employment within the private enterprise system. And it is *desirable* to forge such national unity because this can provide the best internal situation for fulfilling the agreements of the Moscow and Teheran Conferences, which is so decisive for America's future. It is desirable to do this because in these circumstances the American working class and people, in unison with all other patriotic forces, will be in the most favorable position to combat and defeat the most reactionary and aggressive imperialist sections of monopoly capital, and to strengthen and advance the cause of democracy and peace.

* * *

Now, a few words on the proposed change in the name of our Communist organization. I agree fully with the view of Comrade Browder that it is timely and advisable to substitute the term "Association" for that of "Party." For one thing, this change, if adopted, can help dramatize before the country a number of our objectives in the period ahead, as well as some of the distinctive features of our organization.

A change from "Communist Party" to that of "American Communist Political Association," by its very formulation, will markedly symbolize one of the main political conclusions at which we have ar-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rived for the present and next period of political developments within the country. It will help show that our organization is not orientated upon a course of seeking governmental power now or in the postwar years immediately following. This change would, to some extent, serve to emphasize in broader circles that we are bending every effort to organize a national coalition of all patriotic, anti-fascist forces *now and on the morrow*, so as to speed the destruction of Hitler and the Axis, *and* to ensure and maintain a just and durable peace. It should serve to focus attention on the fact that after the war, *within the country*, we are pursuing a course of unity of action to protect and improve our nation's democratic institutions and liberties and to promote maximum production, employment and social security within the framework of capitalism.

Obviously, there is another reason which points to the advisability of changing from Party to Association. In making such a change we would not merely change our name, but also our electoral status. It is true that in so doing we would lose the privilege of an electoral party, including the right to nominate and run a party ticket (a right which today is considerably curtailed). Yet by so doing we might obtain the right and opportunity to participate in one or another of the major election campaigns in conjunction with, and along lines similar to, that employed by the Farmer-Labor Association of Minnesota, the United Labor League of Philadelphia, or the Washington Commonwealth Federation. And, most important, we would be able more effectively to strengthen our collaboration with broader sections of the labor movement which are developing greater political understanding and activity, but which in electoral campaigns operate through, or vote for, progressive candidates of one or another of the major parties or existing state Farmer-Labor parties.

As for the 1944 Presidential and Congressional elections, there can be no doubt that we will support the win-the-war candidates put forward from the camp of national *unity, irrespective of party label.*

Certainly, the change which we propose from Party to Association should facilitate the practical application of our unity policy in these fateful wartime elections. It should facilitate our collaboration with the other political groups and labor forces during and after the elections, especially if we work correctly and convincingly explain our move. It should remove certain artificial barriers which now hinder a large percentage of party members, including thousands of Communist trade unionists, from working more closely together, and in a normal fashion, with other labor and progressive forces in one or another of the established party primary and election campaigns.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the proposal to change from Party to Association is necessary and desirable from a longer-range viewpoint. For the outlook is that after the 1944 elections, the political re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alignments which are now taking place and will continue to unfold, most probably will crystallize in one of two ways; either by a basic regrouping within one of the major parties, in which labor and the popular forces would secure a leading political influence and position in many existing state, city and precinct organizations; or, if this fails to materialize, it is likely that there may emerge a third party, nationally, as a leading and decisive mass party, based on unifying the labor and people's organizations in collaboration with the progressive forces from both existing major parties.

In either event, or whatever the specific form the crystallization of progressive, anti-fascist political alignments may take following the 1944 elections and in the immediate post-war period, the change of our own organization's name and electoral status can help advance the unity of the democratic camp, the unity of Communists and non-Communists within the organization of a broad labor and progressive political alignment or party coalition, irrespective of its form.

In considering a change in the name of the party, the question arises as to whether we might not also select some other name than "Communist." It is clear that conditions might arise in which such a change could or should be made. Such conditions might include considerations regarding a merger or unification of the Communist Party together with other groups of advanced anti-fascist labor forces to form a broader Marxist working class party, in which it might be desirable to choose a new name for the organization. Or, again, factors affecting the legality of the party, or the status of Communists in the trade unions could arise that might warrant changing the name "Communist."

But neither of these or other similar factors exist today. There are no compelling political reasons for making such a move at this time. In fact, there is every reason today to maintain the name "Communist," as well as the Marxist-Leninist character of our organization which will continue now and in the future.

For the name "Communist" has the greatest prestige and helps signify the specific and distinctive characteristics of our organization as the most advanced and progressive political organization of the American working class, as an American Marxist political organization. The name "Communist" denotes better than any other our ultimate goal and programmatic objective. The name "Communist" is bound up with rich and lasting American and international working class traditions and with our own significant contributions to the cause of liberty, freedom and social progress.

Moreover, it is important not only that we make our solid contribution as Communists to the nation, but also that we work openly and publicly as Communists, as Communists in name as well as in fact. This is important especially at present precisely in order to accelerate the growing collaboration of Communists and non-Communists, of that united action which is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indispensable for the anti-fascist unity and future of our nation. These, then, are some of the reasons which, in my opinion, should influence us to retain the word and symbol "Communist" in any new name which we may adopt at this time.

Whatever final decision we may reach on what name to substitute for the word "Party," whether "Association," "League" or "Society," we shall of necessity likewise have to change certain forms of our organization and methods of work. For instance, as already indicated, such a change will alter the forms of our electoral activity in the sense that we shall no longer function during election campaigns as an electoral party with an official party ticket. Those Communists who run for public office will run on one or another party ticket, as candidates supported by a coalition of labor, progressive and other patriotic forces; or, in certain cases as independents.

But whether or not Communists run as candidates—and in the 1944 elections this will be on a relatively limited scale—*we Communists will be called upon to multiply our mass work, including during the elections, in collaboration with the other sectors of national unity,* with all win-the-war forces, especially with the trade unions. This will not only require the most active participation of the Communists in labor's political organizations and campaigns, it will also necessitate a great strengthening and expansion of our independent, Communist political activity. It will especially require that we vastly improve and multiply our mass agitation and propaganda, our Communist political-education mass work, nationally and on a local scale. It will further require that we bring about a radical improvement in the Marxist-Leninist training and development of all party personnel and members, particularly of our trade union cadres, so that we will be better equipped, theoretically and practically, to meet our great responsibilities, to solve the complex strategic and tactical problems of the new historical period we are entering.

Finally, it is clear that whatever changes we may make in our party's name and electoral status, the fundamental objectives and characteristics of our party will remain. For, irrespective of name, we are and shall continue to be an American working class political organization, guided by the science of Marxism-Leninism. And because of this, now and on the morrow, we shall be in the vanguard, defending and promoting, at all times, the vital interests and welfare of the working class and of our nation and people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOT "IN SPITE OF" BUT *BECAUSE*

AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION WHETHER THE UNITED NATIONS COALITION CAN ENDURE *IN SPITE OF* THE DIFFERENCE OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE BETWEEN THE CAPITALIST AND SOCIALIST STATES.

BY ROBERT MINOR

THE high level of the discussion shows that the proposal put forward before the Plenum does not violate, but fits into the experience of the assembled party leadership. The most responsible and mature of our party leaders from all States had already had from their own experience the full preparation for the proposals voiced by Comrade Browder.

From Comrade Browder we received again what we have learned in a quarter of a century of living and working with him that we can always expect from him—a bold, fearless leadership, facing real situations and responding to them as a Marxist, a Leninist, a fighter.

The problems that we face now are unprecedented. The colossal nature of the change of today can be compared, although not contrasted, even with that tremendous change that occurred in June, 1941, that was faced by our National Committee meeting in that month.

It is interesting that just one hundred years ago the first Marxist work was given to the world, a thing that we must not forget in speaking of anniversaries. It is true that Lenin once fixed upon *1843* as the year when "Marx was only becoming Marx." But Lenin also has pointed out many times that the first published work of the young Marx—the work which expounded for the first time the world outlook of Marxism—was published in 1844; it was his criticism of Hegel's *Philosophy of Law*. When we get together for our twenty-fifth anniversary convention this year, we will, I think, also note that along with the party anniversary and the twentieth anniversary of the beginning of our American Marxist publication, both our bringing of classic books of Marxism to the people in English in unadulterated form and also the publication of the first issue of the *Daily Worker* twenty years ago—we will also mark the centenary of the beginning of that science which enabled the peoples of Russia to find freedom and to build the great fortress of world democracy whose armies are rolling across the prairies of Europe today with such "miraculous" success. We, the Communist Party of America, will mark this year the 100th anniversary of Marxism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

* * *

Just now, because of the enormous newness of our problems, we are expected to muff the ball. We are expected to be overawed by the newness of the problems with which history has faced us—to be bewildered by their unprecedented character and to fall back upon old habits of thought. There are those who think we must—by the very newness of the problems—be influenced a little by the cynicism, the *skepticism,* of "smart" journalists.

Here is a small sample of the appeal to *skepticism* by one of the sloppiest of the propagandists employed by Roy Howard, William Philip Simms. Discussing the coalition of our country with its allies as consolidated at Teheran, he practically paraphrases the words of Hitler's recent New Year's greeting, saying: "But no new-born babe ever faced a more colicky or uncertain future than the world does today in this war." What do we think of this for a pro-Nazi version of our country's agreement at Teheran? When Hitler's New Year greeting came out, I remarked to Comrade Browder that it was the only interesting speech Hitler ever made. Comrade Browder replied: "Yes, and it may be the last he ever makes." But that speech is an example to us, as it has been taken as an example by the Hearsts, the Howards, the McCormicks and Pattersons, of just exactly the only possibility for the Hitler cause now. That one last hope of the Hitler cause is to disrupt the coalition by every device, including especially appeals to cynicism, to skepticism, our unwillingness to understand the newness of the situation. "Oh, it is too big a story." "It can't be so." "It is the same old imperialist stuff of the past." "There's nothing new under the sun."

But skepticism is not a part of shrewdness, it is not wisdom. One time Lenin made a little note on the margin of a page of Hegel's *History of Philosophy* where Hegel deals with the ancient Greek Skeptics. The words that Lenin wrote were just three or four: "N.B. Skepticism is not doubt."

I would remark here that doubt is an essential part of the scientific method. It is a spur to action. Doubt drives us forward toward its own negation, until the doubt is resolved and gives place to scientific presumption or proof.

But skepticism is something else. Skepticism is a part of the general school of the philosophy of idealism. Skepticism is an attribute of inaction, of agnosticism, of helplessness. We are faced now with every possible appeal to a sort of a "smart incredulity," which is really no more than the old, dull-witted cynicism of men who are skeptical toward all democracy, all human progress. They make use of all our worst and laziest thinking habits that we unconsciously get out of the cynicism of the petty-bourgeois press.

But we must be bold in our thinking, now, in this absolutely unprecedented situation—as bold as Stalin was when he said in July, 1941, that the results of this war would be what all now know they will be.

We must be as bold in our understanding and in our acceptance of the scientific presumption of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present situation as Stalin was when he said that Hitler would fail to bring about that which he sought—an alliance of all capitalist states against the socialist state; when he thought that the division upon which the war must necessarily be fought would be that division which, within a nation, is a division between classes, and in the international arena would be projected as a division between the socialist state and all capitalist states. Stalin saw that division in this coming war, the alignment of states in the war which, now being fought, would be the result of the decisive forces of history of this time. The alignment would be determined by the enlightened national interest of the peoples, by their common interest in civilization and national freedom and economic welfare. The initiative which the patriotic forces, of all classes, of all countries would put into it would determine the line of division. It would be the division between the Hitler reversion to the Middle Ages and conquest on the one hand, and democracy on the other hand, which must necessarily include the democracy of the most forward-moving of all the societies of the modern world, the socialist state. It has been proven on battle fields where millions have died, that the concept of democracy that corresponds to reality now is that which includes the democracy of the socialist state and that of the capitalist states.

* * *

Is this coalition stable?

We are tempted to fall into concepts in regard to the military actions that are taking place now on the front which would be injurious to our thinking. There is an old liberal, pacifist belief that military victories don't count for much. "After all," the pacifists think, "battles are meaningless, bloody slaughters—and in the end everything just returns to where it was."

But for our understanding of the present situation we cannot indulge in that foolishness. We must understand when a military victory of decisive and large scale is fought and won *by that side which represents progress in social evolution, movement forward,* that *such* a military action sticks and lasts and changes the very foundations of the world. We are witnessing now the biggest military deeds that men have ever performed and the most colossal victories ever won are being won by that cause which will perpetuate the effects of the victory, because it represents what Lenin called the general democratic world movement. From this point of view you must understand the enormous, decisive military victories before you can approach with a clear mind the question of stability of the coalition.

A word about the stability of the coalition that has been formed now, not only for the war, but also for a long extension after the war. Its extension into the post-war period gives occasion for many to raise still more sharply the question of whether we are justified in confidence as to that stability. People say, "Oh, well, the difference between the social structure of the socialist state and the capitalist states of America and England is bound sooner or later to cause a disrup-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion." That, of course, again is a repetition of the theme both of Norman Thomas and of Hearst, and that of Hitler's New Year's greeting.

But when people say this and ask us about it, sometimes we do not quite correctly answer the question. Too often we take the question on its face value and reply: "Yes, the coalition can endure and be strong *in spite of the differences of social structure* between the Soviet Union and on the other hand the United States and Great Britain."

However, when we answer the question that way, we are overlooking something of greatest importance—the essence of the whole question. We will then have failed to think into the essence of it. We will be giving a superficially correct answer: that—yes, the coalition is stable and can last. But we will also be giving an *incorrect* answer in saying or admitting that the strength of the coalition is brought about *in spite of* the inclusion of a socialist state together with capitalist states in the coalition.

Of course, it is true to say that the coalition is strong and will last, but it is untrue to say that its strength and capacity to continue is *in spite of* that difference of social structure. Think of this. Like most political questions, we can begin to get at the truth of it only when we get away from the abstract form of it and get down to the concrete, remembering that "there is no such thing as abstract truth; the truth is always concrete." And let us get down to the concrete. Let's ask just what was the difference between the League of Nations of 1919 which was doomed to death from its beginning, doomed to break up, and doomed to cause another war and to die—what was the difference between that coalition that led it to death—and the *present* coalition which is strong, and will live?

Exactly the distinction lies in the fact that the coalition of 1919, called the League of Nations, did not have and *could* not have had under the conditions of the time a character such as would have made possible the inclusion of states of different social structures; concretely, the then new-born socialist state. It was a coalition directed against the general democratic world movement, the world movement of historic development which in the deepest sense was headed at that time by a weak socialist state.

And in the present coalition of the United Nations it is precisely because of the inclusion of the socialist state—now grown to colossal strength—along with the most advanced of the great capitalist states, that its strength, its power to endure, is to be found.

In short: The coalition of the United Nations is strong *not in spite of*, but *because* of its inclusion of the states which are of different social structure; although they are not *only* different, they are also alike in some decisive respects.

Let's prove that the coalition is strong because of the inclusion in it of the two divergent social structures. Assume that the Soviet Union were left out. I see you begin to laugh. How long would this coalition endure if it were one in which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were excluded? Of course, that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would mean that such a coalition would become an instrument for working against the current of the democratic world movement, which, as Lenin pointed out so beautifully, must include the socialist labor movement, and, after the formation of a socialist state, must include that socialist state. A coalition of such kind would be a joke, a hideous joke of death. No coalition can come into existence except the coalition such as we have, unless it were a coalition like that of the Axis with Vichy France attached.

We must understand that the present coalition is strong and will last because the peoples are made to see its strength precisely in the fact that it *does* include the great state which is operating before their eyes in such magnificent fashion on the battlefield.

The coalition is strong, *not in spite of,* but *because* of the inclusion of states of different social structure; that *is,* in the *concrete* world, *not the abstract.*

Outside of the field of military aspects, the strange new fact is that the socialist economy of the Soviet Union, through the enormous size of that country and its wealth and strength and economic development through the Five-Year Plans, this stability of the socialist system, of the enormous Soviet state, has become, under the new conditions, a source of world economic stability without which there could not be anything but economic ruin after a war of the size of this one. I don't know but what it might be a little too mechanical, but I will take a chance in using the term "gyroscope" to show that the effect of a great, stable socialist economy in the midst of the post-war world—a socialist economy of a state which has shown itself the most capable of permanent existence, the strongest militarily, possessed of the greatest internal unity. The effect of this stable economy in the set-up that was made in the Teheran and Moscow and Cairo agreements is absolutely essential. A long-time economic collaboration would not be possible with a Europe that was torn into a thousand fragments, with states of doubtful permanence rising and falling every week, and rival parties leading rival armies to civil war, and petty states making raids across the borders for the territories of others. But when the great, powerful Soviet Union, standing astride the European and Asiatic continents, fully able to take care of itself, permanent, strong beyond measure, enters into a coalition with the United States and Great Britain, looking to the stabilization of democratic governments of all of Europe and Asia, there can be, there will be a stability of world economic and political relations such as was never known before. This coalition can receive the support of the labor movement and of all classes, capitalist included, which see the national interest of their countries. It brings what Stalin as well as Roosevelt and Churchill said can be many generations of peace and economic stability.

We as Marxists know that the world market is an indispensable part of the consideration of all questions of stability and the continuation of the lives of peoples. And what is the world market like now?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let's again get away from the abstract and get to the concrete. Three-fourths of the world market consists of the European continent; and as for population, half of the world's population is in Asia. All of these peoples, three quarters of the peoples of the world, are neighbors of the Soviet Union, against whom there cannot be successful imperialist war. The Soviet Union has a state which by its very nature does not commit aggression and does not exploit labor either at home or in the form of colonial oppression. The role of that great Soviet Union in respect to its influence in bringing confidence and permanent solvency in a market that includes three-fourths of the world, in which stable credit can be established almost without limit and with complete ability of all to fulfill obligations, is enormous and utterly without precedent. Not in spite of, but because of the difference of its social structure, this is true.

Just a little remark by way of illustration. Suppose very hard-headed bankers, sitting in New York, were considering the question of world markets in the post-war period or before then. Where can they send their valuable goods with assurance that the states under which the purchases are made have permanence and serious ability to guarantee meeting of obligations? Suppose there is a proposition from a government of King Peter of Yugoslavia. Perhaps they would reach into a drawer and look over again the reports of the strength of Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia. Perhaps they might conclude that Earl Browder was right in all these past months since he came out of prison, hammering away, day in and day out, on the question of Yugoslavia and the true character of the struggle in that country. They might begin to see that in the rise of democratic governments throughout the continent of Europe, governments which cannot be invaded and cannot be suppressed as Hitler and Mussolini suppressed Republican Spain, is the only possibility of an orderly world market opened to the full production of the industries of the United States and England, expanded to astronomical dimensions. This will be the stability of governments jointly recognized, as they will be, by the United States, Soviet Russia, Great Britain and China.

Someone might perhaps fear that there might be a little something in what Norman Thomas said, that this is imperialism; that, after all, Stalin, who always had a bold mind, might now go in for imperialism. Or perhaps we are here advancing a variation of the ill-smelling old-aged theory of Karl Kautsky; that there might be a sort of, what Hitler calls a "Bolshevik-plutocratic" set-up that would bring about a sort of "ultra-imperialism" overcoming the tendency to war and bringing about a sort of peace but on an imperialist basis.

But when Kautsky put forward the thesis of "ultra-imperialism," the world union that he saw in his mind was a world union of an entirely different character. The forces of reaction dominated, and a peaceful course could not be expected from such a combination as the great imperialist states under the conditions of that time.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But if we, as Marxists, understand exactly what is meant by imperialism, and don't just make of imperialism, as Lenin said Plekhanov did, a sort of "swear word"—if we begin to understand what imperialism is, we must see readily why a coalition such as the present one, containing a great socialist state with the most democratic of capitalist states, has nothing in common with the ultra-imperialism that Mr. Thomas now likes to fear.

For the balance wheel of the great economic and political collaboration of this coalition that will last through the war into the peace is not a synthesis of rival imperialist states. Even though there will doubtless be import of capital to Europe and Asia, there will be no loss of the independence of nations.

The Socialist State, rising as it has risen beside the great capitalist states, and small capitalist states, and semi-independent states, becomes a transforming influence which makes possible the reaching of this agreement which now has brought both in the world and within America a completely new situation.

Because of this we face in America completely new problems. Not long ago, at the time of the decision of the Supreme Court on the Schneiderman case, I attempted a little analysis on the basis of the arguments of the Supreme Court on the question of the true nature of Marxism, as to whether Marxism under all circumstances implied the violent overthrow of the state, etc.

I will only add a little to that. We remain Marxists fully, we understand, for instance, what Lenin said in the midst of the Revolution of 1905 in July: "Great questions in the life of nations are settled only by force. The reactionary classes are usually themselves the first to resort to violence, to civil war; they are the first to 'place the bayonet on the agenda,' as the Russian autocracy has been doing systematically, consistently, everywhere. . . ."

And, in this war, we have not the disproof of that, but the proof of it. For this war is indeed the settlement of great affairs of nations, and surely it is by force. The greatest violence that mankind has ever seen since time began is here, making this tremendous transformation in the affairs of nations. And some people don't understand it, cannot see it, are puzzled. They wonder if perhaps after this cataclysmic struggle which capitalist states are involved in, perhaps in order to comply with "Marxism," we must have another war, but a different kind of war, to settle things in another way.

Once upon a time a very despicable character who met his deserved fate in the Moscow trials not long ago, a gentleman by the name of Bukharin, wrote a book called *Economics of the Transitional Period*. In that book he said, for instance, that "each type of production has its corresponding type of state, and each type of state corresponds to quite a definite type of war." After Lenin died, on his desk was found a copy of that stupid book, and on the margin besides this opinion of Bukharin's, Lenin wrote, "Not one." In another place Bukharin brought forward his stupid, anarchist concept that: "Social-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist war is class war which must be distinguished from mere civil war. The latter is not war in the proper sense of the word, for it is not war of two state organizations." On the margin in that place Lenin wrote, "Ooph! Oh Help! Total confusion! The author has too great a love of showing-off by a play on concepts, giving this out as sociology." I think everyone will recognize Bukharin's concepts in what we see now in the Norman Thomas and Trotskyite press, to the effect that this war doesn't count and there must be another war after it.

Let us understand, comrades, fully and clearly, that war is war and that this war is what has been said time and again by the leaders of our movement—it is a war between the medieval, bestial reaction, a world axis of Nazism, and world democracy on the other hand. And let us understand the organic connection, despite all things that will and must be said in criticism of bourgeois democracy—the organic connection of democracy, whether that democracy be in the distorted form that we know in bourgeois states, or whether it be a higher form that we also know. If we understand this, we will understand many of the problems before us.

For instance, when Comrade Reale, secretary of the Naples Italian Communist Party, made a statement not long ago, that there will be no dictatorship of the proletariat in Italy, we must understand that this was an absolutely correct course in which Comrade Reale and his party saw that there must be in Europe that fusion of the forces which have been brought together by history in opposition to the fascist yoke and that in it the progress of the cause of all mankind, as Stalin called the Spanish Republicn cause in 1936, will gain.

We are now entering into a period in America and in Europe in which we are compelled to realize and to develop fully both in a theoretical and practical sense, that Marxism which has been developed for the past quarter of a century under different circumstances from those of today—when there was not yet a great, powerful socialist state so heavily influencing the course and concert of nations. Marxism, which has its completely scientific approach to questions like those faced by the Russian proletariat in 1917, has also its completely scientific grasp and its fully developed methods which we have to apply to the unprecedented situations of today. The science of Marxism is equally valid and is the only scientific means to meet situations like the present.

Under Comrade Browder's leadership, we are going into a new historical period, which in the United States for the next years brings to the fore peaceful reforms and electoral action—a period in which we must develop in new ways our capacities for leadership of masses.

Marxism serves the cause of humanity here in this period as well. Many years ago, in the 1880's, when it was not a period like this one—there never was one like this, but there was at least a period when parliamentary possibilities were at a rather high estate—some of the French Socialists went to London to ask Marx and Engels' advice

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the course of their movement. Marx formulated for Jules Guesde, the French leader, a famous passage —that universal suffrage in France and Germany, because of the peculiar development at that moment, had been transformed from a means of deception, which it was heretofore, into an instrument of emancipation. Marx was a Marxist, even if he did deny it once, and we American Marxists have to understand, among other things, that now the instrument of parliamentary democracy under conditions of today can and must be developed to secure great achievments for our nation and people.

During the struggle over the anti-Socialist laws in Germany in 1878, Marx gave a little example in respect to the question of violence or of peaceful social change, making a point that is very important for us theoretically. When the Communists were being persecuted and lied about, and it was being said that they must always be for a violent course, Marx said:

"A historic development can remain 'peaceful' only so long as no violent hindrance is placed in its way on the part of the holders of social power of the time. If, for example, in England or the United States, the working class were to win the majority in Parliament or in Congress, then they might in a legal way remove the laws and regulations standing in the way of their development, although, of course, only insofar as the social development might indicate. Then, however, the 'peaceful' movement might be transformed into a violent one through the resistance of those interested in the old condition of things; in that case they would be (as in the American Civil War and the French Revolution) struck down by *violence* as rebels against the 'lawful' power."

The present world conflict is a war which breaks down those obstacles which—placed in the path of social advance—bring about the inevitability of violence. I mean concretely the breaking down and removal from the scene of Europe the obstacles which Marx said made violent revolution inevitable on "the Continent." As though for the "convenience" of History, the "filthy, bloody morass of bureaucratic, military institutions" has been gathered into the catch-basin of Hitler's rule of Europe: There remains no "bureaucratic-military institution" on the Continent except that which will be "smashed"—annihilated by military violence in this war—that of Hitler and the Quislings.

An American historic example which served Marx is good for us as well. In this period we approach our American public in the spirit of this plenary meeting as it has been so well given in Comrade Browder's report. We break down the barriers between us and the masses. We will banish forever those cleavages which had historically divided the Marxist movement from the great mass of labor. The time has come for that. It will be realized, and the American Communist Party will soon, in my opinion, forever leave isolation, will be accepted as a natural part of the labor movement. The magnificent future before us is thereby guaranteed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW PROBLEMS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION

BY JOHN WILLIAMSON

COMRADE BROWDER'S Report to the Plenary Meeting of the National Committee emphasized that the Teheran Conference was the turning point in the solution of the many complex problems both of the war and of the post-war reconstruction period. While the Moscow Conference already had indicated that the inner crisis which threatened the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition had been overcome, Teheran cemented the coalition on the basis of principles that are known to all.

As a consequence of Teheran and the perspectives agreed upon for the period of post-war reconstruction, one of the conclusions recommended in Earl Browder's report is the change of the term "Party" in the title of our organization to "Association." This conclusion is very important to our relations with all other forces of the win-the-war coalition in our country. Unquestionably, this will be a subject of tremendous public discussion, in which we want our party members to participate not only within the party confines, but beyond, to help bring clarity to workers and the people generally. This will help cement our relations, politically and organizationally, with new tens of thousands of Americans.

The better to understand this recommendation for the change of name, we must avoid two initial reactions, one the extreme of the other: either, that the change would mean little and that we would function as before, or, that our role as a Marxist organization based on the working class would be liquidated or replaced; that the "Communist Association" would be less important than the Communist Party, and that, consequently, increasing its membership and extending its influence would no longer be on the order of the day. Both these approaches would be wrong and should be rejected.

The reason for the recommendation has been dealt with in great detail by Comrade Browder.

* * *

In the light of the perspectives and the political condition Comrade Browder outlined, what will be the political function of such a Communist organization? Indeed, wherefore such an organization?

Such an organization is indispensable and its political influence and organizational strength must be multiplied many times over, because:

First, as history has so amply attested, our Marxist-Leninist theory and program enable us, in distinction

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from all other forces even within the coalition, to understand events, foresee their course, evaluate the relationship of forces and groups within the country, and help influence and determine the direction of events.

Secondly, a Marxist political organization of the type envisaged is indispensable because of the urgent need to facilitate and speed up the unity and greater organization of the labor movement and to raise the political understanding of the workers to new levels, commensurate with their responsibilities. In other countries, because of the absence of a two-party system such as we have, the direction of accomplishing this is through the affiliation or integration of the Marxist forces with the mass political parties of the workers; in the U.S.A., as yet, there is no mass political party of labor. It is definite, however, that the working class in our country is maturing politically and is finding organizational forms other than a Labor Party of national scope, even as it moves in the direction of independent working class political action. As a Marxist political organization we have an especially great responsibility during this year of the fateful 1944 elections. We must facilitate this political development of labor and help achieve the maximum political unity of all labor as a part of the great coalition behind the Commander-in-Chief in the 1944 elections. The understanding, unity, and, above all, the political organization of labor in the Wards and Congressional Districts, as an integral and vital part of the win-the-war coalition of all classes and patriotic Americans, can well be decisive in ensuring victory this year.

Communists can be particularly helpful in facilitating this joint labor political activity and organization because ever-growing numbers of workers and leaders of all labor and people's organizations are learning to respect the understanding, the organizing ability, the self-sacrificing work and the consistent honesty and principled devotion of Communists everywhere in struggling for correct policy and actions, in the interest of our class and nation.

* * *

How will the "Communist Association" conduct its day-to-day mass work? Just as now, Communists will continue to help build, activate, and participate in leading trade unions and all people's organizations. Within these organizations they will contribute their best in ideas and activity and will subordinate themselves to majority decision. We will, as an organization, react to all vital issues in the communities, cities or nation that concern the people. We will strive, wherever possible, to stimulate the organizing of the broadest mass movement around such issues on an effective program, and, as a Communist organization, become an integral part of this mass movement.

In the field of electoral activities, as part of the labor movement or of other people's organizations, among Negroes, national groups, women, church people, or youth groups, Communists will participate in those political parties or support such candidates as represent the best interests of our nation, in accordance with the principles of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strengthening the win-the-war coalition for victory and an enduring peace. Wherever Communists are active in such people's organizations or coalitions, they have had and have no reason to aim at "capturing" them. On the contrary, our aim is to collaborate with all other people's forces. Our only desire is to contribute to the common goal, to assume responsibility and activity with all of our ability, and to participate in leadership to the extent that the majority desires.

In our own activity as an organization, we shall be able less and less to get along with old formulas and practices. Our activities as an organization will have to be examined in the light of new events and experiences. It is already clear that increased emphasis must be placed on education and mass propaganda. The press, literature, schools, etc., must occupy a hundred times more of our time and effort than today. Does this mean we are reducing ourselves to a mere propaganda organization? Nothing of the kind. At this moment, when leadership by example in all fields of mass work—especially in the labor movement, among the Negro people and the national groups, among the women and professionals—is so urgent for victory in the 1944 elections, *political clarity and understanding are a decisive contribution toward, and an organized part of, effective mass political action and organization.* The "Communist Association" as a workers' political-educational organization will be fulfilling its Marxist vanguard role to the American people and nation.

* * *

Let us examine further the content of the work of the members of such a "Communist Association." The increased emphasis on education will be directed first of all to our own members, and to those sections of the labor and people's movement with whom we are collaborating. But in addition by utilization of all educational weapons—the *Daily Worker,* the *Worker, The Communist,* the *New Masses,* the Marxist-Leninist classics, as well as popular literature, schools, forums, and debates—we shall increase our efforts to make our thought and principles available to the people in all communities. It is clear that regular reading by every Communist of the *Daily Worker* and *The Communist* becomes a hundred times more urgent than ever now.

While the average thinking worker learns through struggle and experience, that is not enough for us. We must study. We must understand Marxist-Leninist principles in order to help influence the course and outcome of struggles—whether it be a single struggle or the developments in the nation and the world. We also learn from our participation in the struggles how better to apply the strategy and tactics of our policies and how to enrich Marxist-Leninist theory itself. The first piece of literature for the current Recruiting Campaign—Earl Browder's *A Talk About the Communist Party*—is as indispensable for the party member as for the prospective recruit. That pamphlet says:

"The first responsibility of party membership is that each one of us has to systematically improve his own mind. . . . The more the mem-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bers educate themselves and the more consciously they organize their own self-education the stronger they emerge as party members and party leaders. . . . One of the shallow misconceptions of the party is that once you join the party you can stop thinking for yourself; that the party does the thinking for you and hands down the decisions and all you have to do is to be a disciplined member and carry them out."

The whole emphasis in Comrade Browder's pamphlet is to root out such misconceptions. It stresses the need of raising the level of understanding of the individual party member and the strengthening of his own ability to answer all problems that arise. It points out that the accomplishment of this aim will greatly strengthen the collective thinking and actions of the party. This understanding is particularly essential today in finally completing the transfer of trade union comrades to community branches and actively involving them in community branch activity.

* * *

The "Communist Association" is conceived as a Marxist political-educational organization. Therefore, it will not stand on the sidelines merely educating or propagandizing. Even more than now—but with better political equipment—we will react to and develop mass activity around all vital issues affecting the workers and the people as a whole, whether in a neighborhood, a shop, an industry or in the nation itself, and we will join with all others in advancing all progressive causes.

This will necessitate the fulfillment of all previous undertakings to improve the political character of Party Club meetings and especially to deepen the democratic processes and extend the democratic character of our meetings and organization as a whole.

We are not yet prepared to give answers to all questions as to the form of organization. In the course of preparing for the National Convention, these will have to be worked out. *But even now it is clear that for us as an organization the present community form of Club or Branch is the best and should continue.* Changes in structure would only be necessary to facilitate our working freely as Communists as part of election coalitions.

Last June we decided to make real changes concerning the extension of democracy in our ranks. Although Branch elections are taking place everywhere this month, not enough real effort has been put into thinking out and carrying through even those elementary steps we outlined. With the anticipated change in organization, this question must be taken hold of energetically. Of particular importance is one problem that has received enthusiastic attention wherever it is raised. I refer to the need of changing the kind of educational discussions in the Branches. As yet, too often the discussions do not relate to the salient issues of the moment. Furthermore, the method of presenting ideas must be changed in order to stimulate and provoke discussion and thus guarantee clarity. Too often the opposite effect is attained and the outcome is a minimum of organized discussion and clarity in the Branch meeting and much unorgan-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ized discussion without adequate clarity outside the Branch meetings. We must correct any isolated distortion of our correct emphasis on deepening and extending democracy. This shall not be allowed to degenerate into a sloppy liberal approach of a Section or County Committee deciding for itself whether it will carry out a decision or policy of a State or National Committee. While each lower organization should strive to find more effective methods of achieving the common goal agreed upon, supposed differences with methods of work recommended, that are not replaced with still better methods, and the resultant accomplishment of tasks, might indicate that consciously or unconsciously, the differences are political and not organizational.

* * *

Now, what are the perspectives of growth of the "Communist Association"? We have a right to expect that, in this period of intense political thinking and activity of the American people, increasing numbers of workers will want to learn the answers to the complex problems before them. There is a tremendous desire among them to see the road that lies ahead to social progress. They will want to come together in political association with one another and will be ready to join an organization that represents their views. Since we know that the "Communist Association" will facilitate and help promote unity, understanding and activity, and that joining will not limit the mass activities of its members, we feel that the attractive power of this organization is great and that it will grow.

The new developments and the changes recommended at this Plenum make it possible to win many thousands of new recruits to a Marxist organization at a tempo that has not been possible previously. Why? Because:

1. The methods of functioning that we shall adopt will make clearer and emphasize to the prospective recruit the possibility of supporting Marxist policies through membership in the "Communist Association" without leaving his or her own mass organization. While this is true even today, it has not always been fully understood, and some of our Branches have contributed to this misunderstanding.

2. To those trade unionists who always say that their union is taking on political forms of activity and therefore they are waging the same fight as we are, we should be able to point out more convincingly that struggle alone is not enough. Membership in a Communist Organization, which is in no sense a "competing" organization, will help them, through the acquisition of Marxist understanding on current issues of the day, to be more effective workers and leaders in their unions and mass organizations.

3. These changes should also stimulate widespread recruiting by enabling us to come to grips still more boldly and effectively with the slanderous misconception that Communists are not part of American life but are "agents" of somebody or other. We will force people to discuss our ideas and proposals on their merits—not under conscious or unconscious misconceptions.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our present and future members should everywhere take their place as Marxists, defending their rights and ideas publicly and winning supporters. In the course of such defense of Marxist policies, recruiting should be a normal activity.

* * *

Even prior to our Convention, at which the question of name will be settled, it is appropriate that we demonstrate *now* our ability to recruit thousands of new members into our party ranks as we involve all our friends, sympathizers and prospective recruits into an intense enlightenment campaign around the content of Earl Browder's report.

To those who may think it is not decisive whether we carry through to success the present Recruiting Campaign, I would emphasize:

1. The fact that a stoppage in the steel industry can still take place on the very day that General Eisenhower is announced as the Commander of the Second Front, demonstrates the crying need for a larger party and a more politically equipped party membership among the steel workers. There are similar conditions and provocations in other industries—the electrical-radio industry, for example—and yet the workers and their leaders have not committed the blunder as in the steel industry That shows greater understanding and undoubtedly greater ability to influence the workers and to seek alternatives to strikes. It also reflects a larger and more influential party membership in these industries. Another example was the splendid struggle of the Transport Workers Union in New York. The T.W.U. was subjected to a hundred times greater provocation and difficulty than the steel workers; yet not only did they refuse to strike, but they substantially won their demands. Furthermore, with the support of the labor and progressive movement, they carried their victory over into the Councilmanic elections. Another, smaller, example is that of a U.S. Aluminum Co. plant in the Midwest which was a center of anti-unionism and a hotbed of local strikes provoked by anti-union forces. As a result of organizing a party of several score members and the collaboration of Communists and non-Communists in the union membership and leadership, the shop is now well organized, the stool pigeons have been expelled from the local union leadership, and on Labor Day the union and the company agreed to install loud speakers in all departments for the workers to listen to the radio Labor Day messages of President Roosevelt and Philip Murray.

The nation has no guarantee that what happened in the steel industry may not occur in the aircraft or rubber industries. In fact, in the latter, it has occurred. Therefore, the emphasis on 100 per cent fulfillment of the present Recruiting Campaign will help guarantee uninterrupted production and defeat of defeatists like Lewis within the labor movement. It will help patriotic labor leaders and workers find effective answers to strike provocations while defending the workers' interests. We recommend a policy of concentration first of all among workers in the auto-aircraft, electrical-radio, steel, maritime and ma-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chine building industries. In such districts as Pennsylvania and West Virginia, coal mining must also be a concentration point, as will be the packing industry in Chicago, Nebraska, and St. Louis, and the shipbuilding industry in all port cities.

* * *

It is possible in this campaign to get hundreds of leaders of trade unions, Negro mass organizations and churches, women's organizations, national group organizations, community and youth organizations, to join our party with thousands of rank-and-file members. Recently a Section Organizer of a large industrial section of the Midwest reported the instance of a union leader of a local of over 10,000 members who has collaborated with the party, reads its press and agrees with its program. He was approached to join the party and agrees, but correctly wants to join openly before the whole world. Asked if he thought the workers would disagree, he was sure they would not, since he has been called a Communist for years and still gets elected to office. In such a case it would be well for such a leader, upon joining the party, to place the matter before several hundred of his shop stewards and active members, telling them that being constantly called a Communist made him get acquainted with the program and the policies of the Communists, and that he then found his own ideas corresponded to those of the party. He should then inform them that although he knows every American, including himself, has the right to any political opinion and membership in any political party, he has decided to tell them about his action. Of course, he will explain that this does not commit the union to his political viewpoint any more than any other local is committed to the Republican or Democratic Party if its president happens to belong to either of these parties, or that a Catholic in the office of local union president commits the local to Catholicism. If this union leader agrees to this procedure, I am confident of what the answer of the stewards will be. His Communist membership will then be taken out of any mystery status and he will be still more effective as a union leader. I am sure there are hundreds of trade union leaders who can be recruited in this present campaign.

2. The success of the present Recruiting Campaign is also linked with victory in the 1944 elections. Twenty thousand additional Communists can mean several times that number additional active workers in joint labor committees in the Wards and Congressional Districts, in the C.I.O. Community Councils, and in the Ward and Precinct clubs of the win-the-war coalition.

3. Furthermore, let it be clear that any failure to carry through successfully the present campaign for 20,000 new members (that is, the total objective of the party) would be utilized to create confusion as regards our purposes in changing our name. *It is possible, in our opinion, to guarantee the success of the Recruiting Campaign by connecting it with a well-organized enlightenment campaign inside and outside the party. Let the new member join with us in ham-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mering out clarity and understanding—in answering every question in anyone's mind that remains unclear—in mobilizing labor and the people to guarantee victory in 1944.

To guarantee success, let me emphasize two further points in our directives: First, the involvement of every member, whether or not he attends Branch meetings, and the need of increasing the tempo of recruiting each week, starting with the first week's results. Second, the organization of new Branches in territories adjacent to existing Branches, by selected groups of members of the old Branch. We consider this to be one of the new and important features of the campaign.

* * *

The question may arise: Does not the proposed change of name from "Party" to "Association," or the dissolution of shop and industrial branches, mean a departure from Leninist organizational principles? This would be to understand Marxism-Leninism as a dogma or collection of formulae. The very essence of Marxism-Leninism is to recognize the constant process of change in the development of society—something applicable to the science of Marxism-Leninism itself.

A real understanding of Marxist-Leninist theory means learning its substance—learning to use it as a guide in the solution of the practical problems that arise under the specific conditions of each country and epoch. The substance of this specific feature of Leninist organizational principles is that the Communist political organization, already equipped with correct policies and perspectives, constantly maintains and strengthens its maximum contact with the working class, teaches as well as learns from the workers, and is thus able to win broad support from the workers and become a larger and more influential workers' political-educational organization.

The proposed changes in name and branch organizational forms correspond to the realities of the present situation and will be the medium of bringing us closer to the millions of organized workers and the people generally. Changing from Party to Association will facilitate the further strengthening of the coalition for winning the war and ensuring a durable peace in the post-war reconstruction years. Dissolving the shop and industrial branches and adopting the exclusive form of community branch, under present-day conditions in our country, does not lessen our contact with the masses. On the contrary, it makes it possible politically to clarify and mobilize our members on all urgent questions confronting the labor movement and the nation; to become active wherever our members are in contact with workers, including shops, local unions, and communities. Under present-day conditions, the community branch provides the most effective organizational form for functioning as an American political organization influencing, inspiring and mobilizing broad sections of the people in the nation's victory drive. The dissolution of the shop and industrial branch removed an outworn organizational form, which threatened to create artificial barriers between Communists and non-Communists

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the trade unions and thus weaken the struggle for maximum unity and threaten the closest relationship between our party and the masses.

* * *

In changing organizational forms, we must combat any tendencies that would weaken the working class basis or practices of our organization. Even prior to now, it seems to me that there have been some isolated expressions of this. They have expressed themselves in attitudes of preferring to raise money to cover deficits in publishing the press rather than effective mobilization for increasing the *Daily Worker* and *Worker* circulation. Further examples are seen in general underestimation by community branches of the problems of trade union comrades and failure to integrate and give political guidance to the trade union comrades formerly in the shop or industrial branches. Lastly, some voices have been heard saying: We can't expect our members to sell the *Daily Worker* or *Worker* at street corners or knock on doors or distribute leaflets because we are now a "different kind of party." Actually, this form of activity is not "prehistoric." Many of our comrades have found, with others in Civilian Defense work, that just these forms of activity are successful in civilian defense, bond selling and other neighborhood war activities.

Objections of the type cited, although very limited, reflect pressure of non-working class membership within the party. We should be alert to such tendencies and correct them without delay.

* * *

Often one hears quoted the very correct statement of Comrade Browder, at a previous Plenum, that:

"When our attention is always on the outside world; when we are always reflecting the problems of the world, of our country and of our community . . . the inner development of our party will proceed better."

Unfortunately, this is sometimes distorted to mean neglect of organization. No one has been more aware of the danger of neglect of organization than Comrade Browder. His Chicago speech certainly should correct those who have not previously understood this danger. Comrade Browder declared:

"My thoughts are turned by the pressure of the international events to the examination of our own party, to the extent of its political education and preparedness, and the degree of its maturity in the art of organization. . . . We must turn our thought to mastering, much more than we have, the difficult art of the organization of our forces, the direction of our efforts along concerted channels."

By combining organization and education we must build a more powerful Marxist political-educational organization and help hammer into shape in the fire of political struggle, the coalition for victory in the 1944 elections.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEHERAN AND THE WAGE POLICY ISSUE

BY ROY HUDSON

THE wage policy question is one of the most crucial and urgent problems before the nation at this time. The solution of this issue will have important bearing on the further prosecution of the war and the realization of the Teheran Conference decisions.

Why at this critical moment in the war has the wage question become an issue that threatens the nation's unity, and endangers the prosecution of the war? Until recently it has been possible to solve wage disputes without interruption of production, on the basis of the Administration's war-time wage policy which has been supported, although with some criticism, by labor, most employers and the general public. The question of a national wage policy was not an issue that seriously divided the win-the-war forces, although the prevailing policy was always the center of attack by the defeatists and obstructionists.

The necessity for wage adjustments does not arise out of a desire on the part of labor to follow the example of others and embark on a course of war profiteering. If labor's policies had been dictated by selfish interest, wage stabilization would never have been realized.

The loyal cooperation of labor was the main factor making it possible to stabilize wages—the only point in the President's seven-point program that was effectively applied. But this achievement alone did not and will not result in wage stabilization.

The interests of the nation and the prosecution of the war are served only if the stabilization program provides for the need of the workers to maintain or secure wages that will enable labor to maintain a maximum of production and fulfill other wartime duties. When wages are controlled and the other phases of the economy are not, this objective of wage stabilization is defeated, with harmful consequences to the war effort and the nation's unity. Prices rise, black-marketing emerges, profiteering goes uncurbed, and the financing of the war becomes more and more impaired. Because this is what happened, the wage level, *agreed to as a matter of national policy as a minimum wartime necessity*, was not maintained, but was lowered. To fail to bring wages into line with increased prices and the inequitable tax program would mean surrender to the enemies of the war effort and the complete victory of their campaign to disorganize the home front. That

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is why labor, through the C.I.O, is correct in demanding that the balance between wages and prices, which the Little Steel formula sought to achieve, be restored.

The treasonable campaign against the seven-point program, which has hampered the organization of the home front on a war basis, has been brought to the stage where labor is compelled to call for wage adjustments. The defeatists now hope to achieve the main objective of their sinister plot against the seven-point program.

Labor's support for, and collaboration with, the Roosevelt Administration has been the solid rock upon which all the attacks on the nation's unity have been shattered during the war. By inciting non-labor sections of the people against the workers' demands, by blocking every effort of the administration to meet and solve the problems posed, by provoking labor into strike actions, the obstructionists hope that President Roosevelt will be unable to command that united support necessary for the prosecution of the war and to guarantee victory in the 1944 elections. The current wage question is one of the key issues around which the enemies of the Teheran agreement hope to hamper the prosecution of the war, disrupt National Unity, and come into power in the 1944 elections. Thus, what is involved is not only the question of wages, but the all-decisive question of National Unity for speedy victory in the war and a people's victory in the elections.

The wage issue, like all other war policy questions, can be solved only on the basis of the collaboration of the major win-the-war forces. It requires that a firm lead be given by the President in coping with this problem. The tactics and policies pursued by labor will be decisive in determining whether or not the collaboration of all required forces is achieved. The fact that the miners did not repudiate Lewis' treasonable strike policy, that the railroad leaders conducted a strike vote, that a brief stoppage took place in the steel industry, all raise the question as to whether labor has fully grasped the answer to this question. The seriousness of this situation is further emphasized when one considers that wage problems are pending in nearly all major war industries.

Notwithstanding these disturbing signs, labor has it within its means to achieve the understanding and leadership needed to meet the situation. This is proven by the degree of responsibility, patriotism and discipline with which the question of whether or not the issue of general wage adjustments should be raised was approached. Notwithstanding the sabotage of the rest of the seven-point program, labor loyally responded last April to the President's "hold the line order." As long as there was any hope of achieving the promised roll-back it did not raise the question of wage adjustments. When it became clear that these steps were necessary, individual unions did not attempt isolated actions, because it was recognized that the decision was one that could be made only by the authorita-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive bodies of the labor movement.

It is to the credit of the C.I.O. and the leadership of Philip Murray, that this situation was faced and correctly acted upon at the Philadelphia Convention. Labor is therefore armed with a correct policy. But while this is true, labor, even the C.I.O., has not fully undertaken to organize the struggle for this program on the basis of a common program of action that will have behind it the combined strength of labor and the support of non-labor forces.

Basing themselves upon the convention decisions, many C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions have formulated demands and served notice to their respective employers—all of which is to the good. But in the main, each union is waging an isolated fight. There does not exist on a large scale an active, organized campaign capable of registering the united support of the C.I.O. as well as the A. F. of L. behind the demands of the unions, especially of the steel workers, and aimed at counteracting and defeating those forces in Washington that seek to prevent President Roosevelt and other Government bodies from carrying through the necessary adjustments in policy. In such a situation, sooner or later, the individual unions involved reach what seems to be the limit of their resources and a crisis develops. In the absence of program and policy aimed at actively involving all of labor and other sections of the population, the unions concerned feel they have exhausted possibilities and can see no perspective. In the absence of a program of action that offers hope of a solution to their problems, a tendency develops to drift into strike actions. This is why no one is justified in drawing the conclusion that the stoppage in the steel industry, or the stand of most of the railroad workers, registered the fact that labor's support for the war is weakening, that National Unity is disintegrating, that labor is making a decision to break with Roosevelt and as a matter of policy is repudiating its no-strike pledge.

These grave events do not reflect a change in orientation and a basic change in policy on the part of the forces involved. They express weaknesses that arise out of a lack of understanding. They are weaknesses that can be overcome in time if those forces who understand what should be done take the initiative in organizing mass support for the demands of the workers and to back up the President and the Government in taking those measures required. While this is true, the fact must be faced that, unless this is done, the danger exists that in the absence of a mobilization of the forces required, more and more unions will drift into strikes. And strikes, whether labor drifts into them or embarks upon them as a matter of policy, will be disastrous.

If the wage adjustments labor is demanding are to be realized, labor must first of all fully understand that the answer to the solution of its wage demands cannot be found on the basis of its past experiences alone. Never in its history has labor undertaken a wage movement under conditions similar to the present.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The settlement of general wage demands in most organized industries today is dependent upon determining national policy. Specifically, the issue to be decided is—will there be a consistent application of the war-time wage policy, or will the Little Steel Formula be applied without regard to the realities of the situation and thereby defeat the objective of wage stabilization and the seven-point program?

Until this issue is decided in some form or other there can be no settlement of the major cases in most industries. Any attempt to dispose of specific industry problems without a settlement of the question of policy but creates further uncertainties, chaos and dangers. What is finally decided in Washington, not in regard to the demands of one or another union alone, but in regard to national policy, will be the basis for working out a solution to the problems as they exist in various industries.

In peacetime, the settlement of a wage dispute in a decisive industry such as steel always was the signal for a wage movement everywhere, and usually became the basis for establishing wage standards in other industries. But the question of a government wage policy was not a factor that then entered into the settlement of the wage the workers received.

During the war, and only following the settlement of the first Little Steel negotiations, did there develop an accepted national war-time wage policy. Until then, no clearly defined policy existed as the basis for settlement of wages during the war, and such a policy was arrived at in the process of settling the specific problems of the steel workers.

Today, however, a policy does exist, and until the question of how this policy is applied is settled, no solution to the wage problems is possible.

Adjustment of wages under these conditions is something that can be undertaken and solved, not by any individual union, no matter how strong, but by the united action and strength of the entire labor movement. The organized strength of labor alone will not effectively solve the wage problem unless the workers also have the sympathy and active support of other sections of the people. Thus, the settlement of wages today involves not only negotiations with the employers concerned but is determined by action in Washington. Labor, in effect, is undertaking to bring about an adjustment in wages for the workers in every industry.

This task, never before undertaken on a similar scale, can be solved, not through strike action, but only on the basis of exercising the political initiative, strength and influence of organized labor backed by the people.

Anyone who accepts the proposition that wages and other problems of the workers must be settled in a manner that guarantees uninterrupted production must draw these conclusions or state that the trade unions are unable during the war to protect and defend the economic interests of the workers.

* * *

Labor must not be confused by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the false arguments that "victory is certain—strikes won't hurt. Roosevelt is going to the right—labor must get its share now—because after the war it will be harder to get concessions from Roosevelt. Strikes, or the threat of strikes are necessary to prod the Government into action."

The certainty of victory has been created, but the war is not won. Neither should anyone get the illusion that the battle of production has been won. Outside of the Soviet Union, the armed forces of the United Nations have not been fully using the material that has been produced. When for the first time our striking power is thrown into those actions that are planned, the production capacity of America will continue to be taxed in order to sustain the actions that will be launched. Interruption of production, for any reason, therefore, is still as great a danger as ever to the capacity of our armed forces to wage the battles that the nation expects of them. *That is why labor must continue to back up the armed forces by unqualified support to its no-strike pledge.*

Hitler's defeat is certain—but the cost of victory is still to be settled. By upholding its no-strike pledge, labor will help insure a speedy victory, thereby saving the lives of many American and Allied soldiers.

Strikes can only help guarantee the victory of the pro-fascist anti-Terehan forces in the 1944 elections. Such a victory, even if Germany and Japan are defeated, would threaten to rob the people of the fruits of the military victory over fascism. Upholding the no-strike pledge is necessary to guarantee that the United Nations win the war, win the peace, and that the 1944 elections are a victory for the people.

As to the question of "strike threats." When you get caught bluffing, you lose. The cards are stacked against labor and every strike bluff will be called by labor-hating employers with the result that the labor movement will be discredited and the justified demands of the workers prejudiced.

The proposition that strikes are necessary to force action on the part of the Government or to "help" the Government, is either a thoughtless or a Hitlerite disregard of the truth and a desperate effort to prevent labor from seeing where its true interests lie.

The coal strike, the steel stoppage, and the railroad situation did not "prod" the Government into action so much as it endangered the chances of the workers to secure the best possible solution to their demands. President Roosevelt's efforts to influence the situation and bring about a solution on the basis of the nation's policies were handicapped because even his ability to act is determined by the relationship of forces. Was not the passage of the Smith-Connally Bill over the President's veto sufficient to make this clear even to the blind? Strikes bring about an unfavorable relationship of forces that hinders the effective collaboration of labor and the Administration, which alone can enable labor to protect the interests of the workers and guarantee victory in the war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Support for and collaboration with the Roosevelt Administration is not just a question of leaving everything to President Roosevelt. It means the active collaboration of labor with President Roosevelt and those other forces supporting him in working out and securing the execution of those policies required for the prosecution of the war and in coping with the period of post-war reconstruction. The very nature of the coalition of forces united around President Roosevelt is such that the Roosevelt Administration cannot but reflect the position of the majority of forces that represents it. Where labor's policy is inadequate, or ineffectively applied, labor's influence is felt only to a minor degree and the position of the Administration will always suffer from limitations and vacillations in its application. But when labor has the initiative, stands united behind a correct policy, and actively rallies the support of other sections of the population, it exerts a major influence in determining the position of the Administration. When this fundamental fact is understood, there can be no question that active collaboration with the Roosevelt Administration is the key that will enable labor, not only to secure an effective solution to its current wage questions, but to solve all other questions concerning victory in the war, the role of America in the post-war world, and the opportunity for labor, with other democratic forces, most effectively to advance the welfare of the workers and all other toilers.

The attitude of the Roosevelt Administration toward labor problems does not arise out of the fact that it is a "special friend of labor," but out of the need to carry through those measures necessary to prosecute the war and to maintain the unity and collaboration of those forces necessary to achieve victory. It is based upon the proposition that if labor has the duty to render unqualified support for the war effort, the Government has the obligation to see that the rights of labor are respected and the means provided for settlement of disputes, otherwise the war effort will suffer. It is this policy and these facts that explain why the miners, and the railroad workers, finally secured at least some degree of settlement of their demands—even though their case had been prejudiced by the treasonable policy of Lewis and the tendency of most of the railroad leaders to fall for the trap set by Lewis and his sponsors. It was not the pressure or threat of strikes that led to these settlements, because this "pressure" could have been easily counteracted if President Roosevelt had desired to base himself upon those forces in Congress, among the employers, and certain sections of the middle class and farmers who were demanding that the miners and railroad workers be dealt with in an arbitrary and uncompromising manner.

* * *

Groundless fears and uncertainties regarding the post-war period create doubts as to the correctness and effectiveness of the policies of today

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and undermine labor's ability to effectively apply them. Some labor forces are disturbed by this question: what policies are required to prevent another war following the defeat of Germany and Japan? That great question is answered by the decisions of the Teheran Conference. Those forces that are agreed upon these historic decisions are capable, if they remain united, of guaranteeing peace in the world war generations to come.

What must be done to prevent economic ruin after the war and the wholesale impoverishment of labor and the people? The Teheran Conference gives the answer to this question, showing that what happened after the last war need not happen after this war. On the contrary, the effective realizing of the decisions of the Teheran Conference opens up the possibility of solving the reconstruction problems in a manner that will advance the living standards of workers and the common people.

Will the policies of labor required to win the war result in its being in a weakened position after the war? Are these policies temporary or will they be applicable after the war? In the light of the Teheran Conference it is clear that those factors that create the basis for a policy of national unity now will continue to operate after the war. The same common interests that compel the collaboration of the forces waging the war will continue to dictate the same collaboration in the period of post-war reconstruction. Therefore, the policy labor has hammered out in the war, further developed to meet the post-war period, provides the basis for working out a solution of the problems of the future. Labor could meet the problems posed by the war, and America's involvement in it, only by working out a change in its program, policies and tactics that was revolutionary in character. It lacked experience in applying such policies. Labor will enter the post-war period in much more favorable circumstances because during the war it has grown in strength, it has acquired understanding and experience upon the basis of which it will be prepared to tackle the problems it will face in the future.

Are the war-time allies of labor temporary allies? Will these allies be on the other side of the fence after the war? Labor can have absolute confidence in the light of the Teheran Conference that its present allies can continue to be partners in the period of post-war reconstruction. Above everything the contribution of President Roosevelt in making possible the decisions of the Teheran Conference makes it clear that the force which led the nation to Teheran is that force around whom the nation can best unite to guarantee the realization of this program. Therefore all the more reason why, without further hesitation, labor must undertake now to guarantee the re-election of President Roosevelt. Therefore, the decisive importance of applying the political action program of the C.I.O. to achieve this all-important aim.

Thus, the estimate of the Teheran Conference given by this plenum helps remove such doubts and fears which are now groundless, and by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doing so enables labor to secure a solution to the current wage questions as an essential part of the fight for realizing the decisions of the Teheran Conference.

* * *

Serious headway has been made in tackling the special problems of the Negroes and women; but labor must recognize that the question as to whether these gains are to be maintained and extended is up for decision in the coming period. It is necessary to note two or three key questions in this respect.

The coming period is one in which the fight for the rights of the Negroes in the unions and in industry will broaden. In those places where this problem has been neglected it will come to the fore. Problems that have not been solved will be tackled more aggressively and persistently. In those industries where large numbers of the workers have entered the unions, the question of their full rights in the unions and representation in leadership will come to the fore as key issues. The auto workers' convention signalized this fact. The greatest initiative must be displayed in advancing the fight on such questions, which were not always the point of emphasis up to now.

The special problems of the women continue to be the most neglected problem in the work of the unions and therefore create an explosive situation in many places. While this is true, it is necessary to note that at least the first beginning has been made in national unions, such as the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, and Longshore Union, to give serious attention to this question. The necessity to face the problem is recognized in a number of unions, and if a more systematic attention is given to answering the practical questions, it is possible to achieve results that will quickly bring about a decisive change in the approach of the main sections of labor to the special problems of the women.

The point that particularly needs to be stressed is that, as the prospects of the war ending arise, the following question is coming to the fore among Negroes and women: "Yes, labor helped us to win the right to work—but will labor fight to help us maintain these jobs after the war?" There is concern about this question and the people concerned are not going to wait until after the war to get an answer. Answering this problem involves many things, including, in my opinion, the need for labor to recognize the need to work out the means of applying the seniority system in such a manner as will take into account the changes in the war and guarantee the right of the Negroes to employment in those industries where they were established during the war. If this is not done and a dogmatic application of seniority takes place, the result can only be that in many cases the Negroes will be eliminated entirely from industry again. Perhaps a partial answer to this question is some system that will guarantee that the proportion of Negroes employed under all circumstances will be at least maintained.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN CAPITALISM AND TEHERAN

BY GILBERT GREEN

IT WAS Stalin who said that there are two schools of Marxism—the school of dogmatic Marxism, and the school of creative Marxism. Comrade Browder has given us a brilliant example of creative Marxism in action. His penetrating analysis of the profound changes that have occurred brings to mind the prophetic thought of Lenin that history is always richer in content, more varied, and more subtle, than the best parties can possibly imagine, because the best vanguards express the consciousness, the will and the imagination of tens of thousands; but history is made by the consciousness, the will and the imagination of tens of millions.

When has this been more true than today—when tens of millions are making history on the field of battle alone?

It seems to me that in our approach to the period ahead we must avoid two dangers. First, the failure to comprehend the deep-going character of the changes that have occurred; the tendency to stick to old shibboleths; the fear of drawing new practical and theoretical conclusions from the new phenomena of our time. On the other hand, we must avoid the tendency that may arise to improvise answers based upon wishful thinking. We are duty-bound to keep our feet more firmly planted on the soil of solid facts than ever before.

Capitalism remains capitalism. Imperialism remains imperialism. Socialism remains socialism. But one would indeed be blind not to see that each of these must operate today under new and more complex conditions and in an ever changing world—must therefore operate in new ways.

I want to discuss a few of the new conditions under which American imperialism must operate and their relation to the basic perspectives outlined by Comrade Browder.

The war has brought about a tremendous acceleration of the concentration of production and capital; has thereby greatly strengthened the relative weight and dominant role of monopoly capital in American economic life. This fact is hardly disputable. But it is a mistake to draw the conclusion from this that monopoly capital is emerging from the war with a greater freedom of movement than in the past.

Let me give an example. We know that monopoly capital tends to restrict economic development, and that this tendency toward economic stagnation becomes most pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nounced in the epoch of the general decline of capitalism.* Yet, what has actually happened? The powerful impact of the war, the development of a war economy, has not only radically arrested this development, it has for the time being reversed it. Total production leaped from the Federal Reserve Board index figure of 108 in 1939 to that of 245 for November, 1943. This represents the most rapid industrial expansion in any period of American history!

We have literally witnessed an upsurge in production; brand new industries have been built; new technological changes introduced; and many new scientific inventions long suppressed by monopoly capital successfully employed.**

Of course, we know that this was brought about by the exigencies of the war, by the incentives of an unlimited market and because this expansion was not dependent upon the investments of private risk capital, but accomplished through outright large-scale government investments in industrial plants.*** But the fact nonetheless remains that this great industrial expansion has taken place and that this has a most direct bearing on the problems and perspectives for the post-war world.

In the pre-war period both government and big business spokesmen developed the pet theory that American industry had been over-developed,* that the year 1929 with its national income of $82 billion represented a high peak hardly to be reached again and never to be surpassed.

Today, however, nearly every spokesman for government and business underlines the point that America's normal post-war income and production must be considerably higher than 1929, in fact, that America dare not go below a national yearly income of $100 billion.**

There are two basic reasons for this change of tune. The first is a hard economic law: the tendency of the declining rate of profit. Modern large-scale industry with its tremendous investments in fixed capital, with its enormous overhead, must utilize more than 50 per cent of capacity in order to operate profitably, and the greater the de-

* From 1860 to 1880, American production increased by 113 per cent; and from 1890 to 1913, by 156 per cent. However, from 1913 to 1929, the rate of increase declined sharply to but 70 per cent and from 1929 to 1932 there was no increase but an *absolute* decline in production of 46 per cent! For an entire decade after 1929 there was no general rise in production as compared with the period immediately prior to it. (From "New Data on Lenin's Imperialism" by Varga and Mendelsohn.)

** A case in point is the jet-propulsion plane which while invented in 1930 was not given a fair trial until the war and now is being proven so successful as may revolutionize the entire aviation industry in the next decade.

*** In a speech delivered on July 21, 1943, Jesse Jones estimated that the government had spent "probably 25 billion dollars in building plants and facilities of one kind or another. The title to most of these properties is in the hands of the government."

* This view was shared by Franklin D. Roosevelt, who, speaking in San Francisco during his 1932 Presidential campaign, stated: "Our industry is already built up. It is a question whether it has not been built up too much. Whoever wants to build new factories and new streets, and to organize new trusts, would be more of a hindrance than a help to us. The days of the great initiators, of the finance titans are gone. Our task is not to find and exploit new material wealth, and not to produce a still greater quantity of commodities, but to learn how to carry on with the existing resources and the existing factories."

** The economic staff of the *United States News* in the issue of December 17, 1943, believes that "the national income in the post-war period is likely to hover around $112,000,000,000." But it points out that this is not good enough as it would represent a "depression compared with war standards, but prosperity compared with pre-war standards."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gree of capacity in use, the higher the rate of profit.* The wartime industrial expansion, therefore, makes more difficult a return to pre-war production levels, for these would no longer be high enough to insure large profits.

The second reason is a political one. Even the most optimistic observers admit that there has taken place such a revolution in production technique and labor productivity, that merely to return to the 1929 production level is to guarantee a permanent army of at least 18,000,000 unemployed.** These observers also admit that the American people will not accept that kind of post-war America. The people will insist that what could be done for war can also be done for peace.***

What are the material possibilities for the realization of the post-war goal of higher production levels? There will, of course, be a considerable backlog of purchasing power in the form of war bonds and savings estimated to total from $100 to $130 billion by the end of the war. Furthermore, there will be a period of reconversion, reconstruction and repair, lasting a few years and requiring considerable outlays of capital. But while both of these factors will undoubtedly give a stimulus to production in the first period after the war, they are not in themselves potent enough to provide a large enough market over a number of years.

Whether higher production levels are possible for any length of time after the war depends greatly upon the creation of a larger foreign market for American goods than at any previous period in our history. And this foreign market is available. The reconstruction of first Europe and then the Far East will create a ready market for American industrial and agricultural commodities for many years and alongside of this America will be in a most advantageous position to meet the increased needs of the Latin-American market.

But this in turn poses another very difficult problem. War-torn Europe and Asia will be in no financial position to buy large quantities of American goods unless American capital stands prepared to finance these purchases for a considerable period of time. This will require a great export of capital—

* With a fall in the national income from $82,000,000,000 in 1929 to $69,000,000,000 in 1930, there was a fall in the rate of profit from 7.5 per cent in 1929 to 1.7 per cent in 1930. With a further fall in national income and production for the years 1931, 1932, and 1933, there was a *minus* rate of profit for these three years, *i.e.*, industry operated at a loss. (From *Statistical Abstract* of the Department of Commerce, and Louis Corey's *Decline of American Capitalism.*)

** The output per man hour increased 11 per cent from 1939 to 1942. In the aircraft industry there was an estimated increase in labor productivity of 50 per cent in the 18-month period ending April, 1943. (From *Economic Notes*, Labor Research Association, October, 1943.)

Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, of the Federal Reserve Board, believes that this country can maintain a 1929 production level with from 18 to 19 million permanently unemployed.

*** Another factor to be considered is the fear of certain business circles that the failure to bring about full employment in the post-war period may in turn bring about a great public clamor for direct government operation of the some 1500 new industrial plants owned outright by the government. They prefer to own and operate these plants themselves.

Of interest also is the fear expressed that unless American capitalism ensures full employment the people may make invidious comparisons between the American and Soviet economic systems. The *United States News* of September 3, 1943, states: "Russia can keep full employment, with government running everything. U. S. and Britain may face serious post-war unemployment problems." And it concludes: "The concern is that Russia's example may influence the populations of Europe. . . ."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a period of large-scale foreign investments.*

Lenin, in his classical work on imperialism, pointed to the new significance attained by the export of capital and established this as one of the basic characteristics of imperialism. And yet, since the last world war the rate of export of capital on the part of world imperialism has steadily fallen and since 1930 the normal export of capital has ceased entirely. In 1929, America's direct investments abroad totaled some $7½ billion, but by 1940 this had declined to $7 billion. In 1930, America's indirect investments abroad totaled more than $8 billion. But by 1935 the value of these investments had declined to less than $5 billion.

What is the basic reason for this relative and absolute decline in investments abroad? It cannot be explained by any lack of idle capital; there were ample quantities seeking outlets for increased profits. Nor can it be explained by any lessening in the role of foreign investments as a means of obtaining and holding spheres of influence and new markets.

It is to be explained mainly by a political factor! *The unstable state of world relations* which tended to transform investments abroad from a sure source of super-profits into a rather precarious undertaking. What were the factors contributing to this unstable state of world relations?

In the first place the Russian Revolution, which not only removed one-sixth of the earth from imperialist exploitation, but also expropriated the imperialist enterprises. The second was the awakening of the colonial millions—the Chinese Revolution, the marked tendencies in Latin America to curb the most ruthless features of imperialist exploitation, as well as, in the case of Mexico, the outright expropriation of major imperialist holdings. All this caused concern for the safety of investments in the backward countries and removed the incentive to make new investments.

A third factor was the reneging of nearly all European countries on their war and post-war debts and the great depreciation in the value and income from foreign investments that followed the world capitalist economic crisis.

And, lastly, was the rise of German fascism and Japanese militarism, the drift toward a new world war and the subjugation and colonization of most of the European nations by German imperialism and most of the Far East by Japan.

If these are the reasons for the decline in foreign investments, what are the prospects for the post-war period, especially if we bear in mind that, without these investments and loans, a much larger foreign mar-

---

* S. Morris Livingston, head of the National Economics Unit of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, in a report for the Department of Commerce, sees foreign sales of food, clothing and industrial equipment at huge volumes after the war—"provided means of paying for them can be arranged."

The *United States News* of October 1, 1943 writes: "They [American post-war planners] cannot see investment outlets inside this country that will absorb savings that now run between $20 billion and $30 billion a year. It is expected that some machinery will have to be devised to guide an important proportion of those savings into fields of foreign investment."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ket for the period ahead is out of the question?

There is only one way by which this problem can be met by American capitalism, and that is by helping to bring into being a degree of world stability.* But this can be achieved only by the establishment of a new equilibrium based upon the new relationship of world forces.

The old "stability" was based upon the imperialist domination of the earth. It was this kind of "stability" that world imperialism sought to re-establish for nearly a quarter of a century. It was for this that American and British finance capital helped bring Hitler to power, armed him and appeased him, with the hope of thereby destroying the Soviet Union, which to them represented the fountainhead of world instability.

But such a "return to normalcy" is no longer possible. To continue to pursue this will-'o-the-wisp is to toy with disaster, for it will bring the very opposite results, as has been so graphically proven by the whole recent course of world events. Any stability that is to be established in world relations after this war can only be based upon the recognition of the new world reality: on the continued existence and ever-growing strength of the Soviet Union; on a democratic Europe; on a greater freedom and independence for the colonial and semi-colonial peoples throughout the world; and on the maintenance of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition as a pre-condition for a durable and lasting peace. Without this there can be no stability and without a degree of stability American capitalism cannot solve its economic problems by peaceful means.*

This in essence is the greater significance of Teheran and why Teheran does represent the complete negation of the bankrupt Munich policy and ushers in an entirely new perspective for world humanity.

Of course, this perspective is not yet realized and cannot be realized without struggle. There are powerful forces in this country that will oppose it, even though the opposite course can lead only to disaster, to America striving to replace German imperialism in the struggle for complete world domination. And the most reactionary sections of American imperialism have far less chance of achieving that objective than had Hitler. Teheran represents the only intelligent course that America can pursue, and its perspective can be realized because it represents not only the interests of the wide masses of the people who want a durable and lasting peace and a greater degree of security, but the interests of American capitalism as well.

* "It is highly doubtful if this country is to finance large-scale projects in other parts of the world that do not promise at least a fair chance of paying out." (From *United States News*, October 8, 1943.)

* On a much more limited scale American capitalism in the past decade has had to take into account the changed conditions in Latin America; had to aim at bringing about a hemispheric unity based upon a new relationship of forces. It was the effects of the economic crisis in the United States, the need for increased foreign markets, plus the threat of fascist penetration in Latin America that brought about the discarding of the old bad-neighbor policy, under which marines followed the dollar and Wall Street puppet governments followed the marines, and its substitution with a more realistic good-neighbor policy. Some of the failures of U. S.-Latin American policy since then have not been a result of the good-neighbor policy but a consequence of the failure to apply this policy consistently.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GEORGE WASHINGTON—PATRIOT AND STATESMAN

BY CARL ROSS

AMERICA this year commemorates the anniversary of George Washington's birth at a moment when our nation is engaged in working out its destiny along the path charted by the Moscow-Cairo-Teheran Conferences. Our nation must choose the path of collaboration with all democratic peace-loving peoples as projected at Teheran, a policy upon which we can also construct enduring national unity, or we shall face the alternative of national catastrophe. This is for us the single, dominant issue determining everything else.

In commemorating Washington's birthday, by drawing inspiration and guidance from the leadership of Washington during the founding years of our nation, we can help today to unite the overwhelming majority of the American people around the only policy that can truly serve our national interest—the policy of Teheran. The enemies of Teheran include among their number those who have helped to weave a reactionary legend about the great figure of the Father of our Country, presenting him to the American people as the symbol of "isolationism" and his Farewell Address as its bible. Our modern reactionaries and Tories invoke the name of Washington and the abstract slogan of "no entangling alliances" to conceal their reactionary and defeatist policies under the mask of patriotism.

It is time, in the interest of a sound policy of national unity and a sound foreign policy, to unmask once and for all these false conceptions of George Washington and to put in their place the real Washington who symbolized, above everything else, the national unity of early revolutionary democratic America and who helped to construct the foundations of our American foreign policy.

* * *

George Washington was an architect of the foreign policy best represented by such figures as Jefferson, Paine and Franklin. He was not only a military leader chosen to head the Colonial armies because of his proven ability as a soldier, but was a patriotic statesman of the first order. Declaring for the unconditional independence of the United States from Great Britain a full year before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, Washington also predicted the necessity for, and the consummation of, the alliance with France long before its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realization. To Washington, the alliance with France was not merely an expedient to win military allies for the Continental armies, but was firmly grounded in *mutual interest.* Recognizing this, Washington, especially through corespondence with friends in France, actively worked to bring about this alliance. Writing to a correspondent in France during the Revolutionary War, Washington pointed out that:

"An immediate declaration of war against Britain [by France], in all probability could not fail to extricate us from all our difficulty's, and to cement the Bond of Friendship so firmly between France and America, as to produce the most permanent advantage to both—certainly nothing can be more the true Interest of France than to have a weight of such magnitude as America taken out of the Scale of British Power and opulence and thrown into her own. . . ." (June 19, 1777; *Writings of Washington,* Vol. V, p. 439, Ford Edition.)

This alliance with France, just as is the anti-Hitler coalition today, was the fruit both of military and diplomatic action. As Teheran was first of all made possible by the splendid fighting action of the United Nations military forces, and particularly of the Red Army on the decisive Eastern Front; the alliance with France, negotiated by Benjamin Franklin in Paris, was, in the first place, the product and the military strategy outlined and carried through by General Washington, Commander in Chief of the Continental troops. The sharp blow to Britain's power in America in the defeat of Burgoyne at Saratoga, achieved through the military strategy of Washington, was the final clinching argument that persuaded the French king that an alliance with America was a practical and necessary means of protecting the mutual interest of each.

Washington well appreciated the importance of this alliance with France, and of French aid, even prior to the formal alliance, declaring that:

"France, by her supplies, has saved us from the yoke thus far; and a wise and virtuous perseverance would, and I trust will, free us entirely." *(George Washington,* Sears, p. 235.)

When Washington, therefore, hailed the realization of the agreement between the United States and France to join arms and not to lay them down separately until American independence was achieved, he was, in fact, celebrating an event which to no small degree was realized through his own efforts. In the American-French alliance, Washington recognized the decisive factor for establishing "our liberty and independency upon a lasting foundation."

But the path from a formal alliance to victory was indeed a difficult one for struggling young America. Full coalition strategy and war had still to be realized; internal enemies of national unity had to be defeated; and negotiated peace maneuvers of the enemy had to be frustrated. The Tory British King's ministers quickly answered the challenge of a united France and America with a two-pronged diplomatic and fifth-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

column offensive. It can hardly be considered a historical accident that the treason of Benedict Arnold, long in the making, was revealed to the nation shortly following the establishment of the French alliance. In fact, Arnold completed arrangements with André to surrender West Point precisely at the same moment that Washington was making arrangements with French admirals as to the best means of joint military action. The treason of Arnold was soon followed by the treachery of Charles Lee, Continental General who at the Battle of Monmouth nearly brought disaster to the American forces by a treasonous planned withdrawal in the face of the enemy, where, in fact, disaster was only averted by the courageous rallying of the retreating army by Washington himself.

Washington knew how to meet the operation of this fifth column in his armed forces and within the nation. André was peremptorily executed; Charles Lee was immediately seized and held for court-martial, and extended efforts were made, with Washington's knowledge, to bring the deserter and traitor Benedict Arnold back from behind the British lines for proper punishment.

The other prong of the Tory offensive against the Colonies took the form of an elaborate "negotiated peace" maneuver through the sending of a peace commission to America with instructions to offer anything short of independence for peace as a means of restoring some measure of British tyranny over the Colonies. Not only did this peace commission make offers of terms to Washington and to Congress but it circularized members of Congress and other American individuals whom it suspected of proneness to connive against America through promoting peace maneuvers a la Vichy of a later epoch. Benedict Arnold, from the safety of the British lines, in the meantime wrote appeals to Colonists to give up the fight for freedom in the guise of an effort to "save" them the alliance with Catholic France. How reminiscent of modern efforts to destroy our alliance with the Soviet Union—under the pretext of "saving" us from Bolshevism! The peace commissioners failed in their mission because of the resolute stand of Congress and of such leaders as Washington who refused to deal with the commissioners and forwarded their correspondence to Congress. Realizing that there was an active fifth column of Tories operating even within Congress, Washington urged upon the President of Congress to be vigilant, and if necessary, to open the mail of members of Congress to see whether they were in correspondence with the enemy. The "doubting Thomases" who close their eyes and refuse to see that the enemy is attempting to break down our present-day anti-Hitler coalition through similar peace maneuvers and fifth-column operations from within might well learn from the Father of our Country.

From the defeat of Burgoyne by the Continental troops to the surrender of the British at Yorktown, Washington's main endeavors were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

directed toward achieving the maximum mobilization of American resources and effective military cooperation between America and France. On Washington's part, there was no inclination to let the French do the fighting for the United States, as among some of our contemporaries who would just as soon let the Red Army fight all of our battles for us. In fact, Washington's first reaction to the French alliance was that America must rise to new heights of military effort. Washington wrote at the time that the French alliance had become a certainty:

"This is a decisive moment; one of the most, (I will go further and say, *the most*) important America has seen. The Court of France has made a glorious effort for our deliverance, and if we disappoint its intentions by our supineness, we must become contemptible in the eyes of all mankind. . . . If we do our duty, we may even hope to make the campaign decisive on this continent. But we must do our duty in earnest or disgrace and ruin will attend us." *(George Washington,* Sears, p. 291.)

Washington's conception of full mobilization of the American nation for the joint war effort with France was based upon achieving complete unity of all the forces fighting for independence. It was based upon smashing the treasonous fifth column, organizing a more effective military force than the Colonial militia through building a regular army by conscription and upon eliminating the profiteering and speculation which threatened national unity and the war effort through economic instability and inflation. When profound dissatisfaction with growing inflation and with the slowness with which America was moving to victory began to be manifested on the very eve of victory even in the form of mutinies among Washington's troops, Washington was quick to point out that the discontent of the people and the soldiers was not with the war itself, but with the manner in which the war was being conducted. He declared:

"The people are discontented; but it is with the feeble and oppressive mode of conducting the war, not with the war itself. They are not unwilling to contribute to its support, but they are unwilling to do it in a way that renders private property precarious; a necessary consequence of the fluctuation of the national currency; and of the inability of government to perform its engagements oftentimes coercively made. A large majority are still firmly attached to the independence of these States, abhor a reunion with Great Britain, and are affectionate to the alliance with France; but this disposition cannot supply the place of means customary and essential in war, nor can we rely on its duration amidst the perplexities, oppressions, and misfortunes, that attend the want of them." (p. 305, *ibid.)*

The situation within the American Colonies before Yorktown was in some respects not unlike that in America today, when the defeatists, "peace now" advocates and fifth columnists attempt to interpret the dissatisfaction of labor and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people with economic difficulties and other problems as being opposed to the war itself. Yet, today, as in Washington's time, it is precisely the individuals responsible for the economic problems that are themselves taking advantage of them to promote treason. Washington's labors, and those of his collaborators, were crowned with victory at Yorktown, a victory which in every respect was the fruit of the American-French alliance and the product of joint strategy finally realized between American and French land forces and the French fleet which bottled up Cornwallis at Yorktown and forced his capitulation.

* * *

With victory won and independence achieved, the dominant aim of American patriots in the years immediately following the Revolution became the assurance of peace and security for the young and struggling nation which had not yet, in the midst of a hostile world, realized its own complete national unification. American national interest required, above all, peace to assure the opportunity to consolidate the gains of the Revolution. Both Washington and Jefferson looked to the vast frontier as the path to expansion and progress for the nation. Washington, aristocrat though he was, was in many respects a product of the frontier, an owner of extensive western lands. It was understandable, therefore, that both Washington and Jefferson strove to establish enduring peace with the objective of settling and developing the frontier territories of America. Washington, for instance, wrote in July, 1784:

"My first desire is to see this plague [constantly recurring war] to mankind banished off the earth. . . . Rather than quarrel about territory, let the poor, the needy, and oppressed of the earth, and those who want land, resort to the fertile plains of our western country, the second land of promise. . . ." (Sears, *Washington*, p. 352.)

But how could peace for America be assured? What were the specific conditions and considerations that guided the adoption of a policy to protect the national interest? These questions must be answered to have any intelligent understanding of the whole concept of American foreign policy that has dominated our political life until this very day.

Our forefathers adopted a policy at this time of "no entangling alliances," of neutrality with regard to the contending reactionary interests dominating Europe. America *alone* of all nations represented in these few years following the Revolution the vanguard of progress for mankind. Immediately following the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, the French and Spanish allies of America in the war, Great Britain and the other monarchies of Europe reshuffled and redivided spheres of influence and colonial possessions on the basis of a new European relation of forces that had been brought about through the defeat of Britain by a coalition which included the "great powers" of Spain and France. America had little or no interest in this settlement of relations between the monarchies of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe; as a new-born Republic in a world of reactionary monarchies it needed to cherish its independence, to steer clear of becoming entangled in the rivalries of European powers. For decades the American colonies had been unwillingly drawn into European wars as colonial sattelites of the European powers; the French and Indian War being a case in point. Colonial experience had already led Thomas Paine to proclaim in *Common Sense,* during the Revolution, as one of the arguments for independence that:

". . . any submission to, or dependence on Great Britain, tends directly to involve this continent in European wars and quarrels; and to set us at variance with nations, who would otherwise seek our friendship, and against those against whom we have neither anger nor complaint."

These were ample reasons, well grounded in experience and national interest, for the policy of neutrality affirmed by Congress in a motion to withdraw the American representative in Russia, on June 12, 1783, on the grounds that "the true interest of these states requires that they should be as little as possible entangled in the politics and controversies of European nations."

This policy, however, of neutrality and "no entangling alliances" was not in contradiction to the policy of active alliance with France followed in the Revolutionary War. It was the other side of the same coin. Both represent a policy of which the common denominator was the *national interest* of America. Those who insist that America *at all times, and under all conditions,* follow a policy along the lines pursued in this period refuse to acknowledge that foreign policy is not determined by a blueprint or sketch but must always be tested by the criterion: does a particular policy serve the national interest at that particular time.

American neutrality toward European quarrels in this period following the Revolution, Jefferson's embargo on both Britain and France in the Napoleonic War: these are instances of a neutrality necessary to the national interest and the larger interest of world progress.

But even at that time the policy of an America compelled to seek neutrality in order to advance its own national interest was not "isolationism." Washington sought peace for all nations, and held to the ideal of mankind bound in "one great family." He saw in the piracy of the Barbary States a factor threatening the rights of all nations and disturbing the tranquility and progress of world order. Foreseeing already the need for the energetic action of President Thomas Jefferson in later years, when America had the power to curb piracy and the moral courage to wield that power, he wrote to his old friend Lafayette:

"On these occasions, I consider how mankind may be connected like one great family in fraternal ties. I indulge a fond, perhaps an enthusiastic idea . . . that the period is not very remote, when the benefits of a liberal and free commerce will pretty generally succeed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the devastation and horrors of war. . . .

"But let me ask you, my dear Marquis, in such an enlightened age, how is it possible the great maritime powers of Europe should submit to pay an annual tribute to the little piratical states of Barbary. Would to heaven we had a navy able to reform those enemies to mankind, or crush them into nonexistence." (*Writings*, Volume XI, page 59, Ford edition.)

Here is no selfish "isolationist" speaking. This was the voice of an American that sought the welfare of mankind and sought to advance the aims of peace and security for all nations. It should be recalled that these were the days when Jefferson, the American representative in France, was aiding in promoting the movement for advancement of democracy in France. And soon the hopes of America for peaceful progress were again intertwined with the interests of France, this time of a France following in the democratic footsteps of America. The French Revolution of 1789 paid its tribute to Washington, now President of the United States, through Lafayette, who forwarded to him the key to the fallen Bastile.

Washington was quick to declare that nothing concerning the welfare of France could be a matter of indifference to him and warmly welcomed the upsurge of democracy on the continent represented by the French revolution. He wrote to the Marquis de la Luzerne in April, 1790:

"You are right in concerning that nothing can be indifferent to me, which regards the welfare of the French nation. . . . Indeed the whole business is so extraordinary in its commencement, so wonderful in its progress, and may be so stupendous in its consequences, that I am lost in contemplation. Of one thing, however, you may rest perfectly assured, that nobody can wish more sincerely for the prosperity of the French nation than I do." (*Writings*, Vol. XI, p. 477.)

Washington was well aware of the influence of America on these developments in Europe, writing that, "I rejoice to see, that the American revolution has been productive of happy consequences on both sides of the Atlantic." (*Washington*, Sears, p. 391.)

The situation had fundamentally changed for the United States. Not America alone, but the United States and France together, now represented the vanguard of democracy and progress in the world. Not neutrality, but active friendship and alliance, between these two powers was the key to the national security and progress of each. Both Washington and Jefferson, then Secretary of State in Washington's Cabinet, held that for its security the United States should seize this opportunity to cultivate reliable friends abroad. Therefore, when France was beset by a concentration of reactionary enemies, they sought a closer alliance between the two nations. Jefferson states this policy in recording a conversation with Washington, dated December 27, 1792:

". . . he [Washington] observed to me that he thought it was time to endeavor to effect a stricter connection with France. He went into

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the circumstances of dissatisfaction between Spain and Great Britain and us, and observed there was no nation on whom we could rely, at all times, but France. I was much pleased with the tone of this observation. It was the very doctrine which had been my polar star. . . .]" (Quoted by Earl Browder, *The People's Front*, p. 297.)

This policy of American-French alliance for mutual security and peace found virulent enemies in the Tory camp of privilege and reaction represented by Federalism and its principal spokesman, Alexander Hamilton. The followers of Hamilton, fearful of the growing democratic upsurge among the mass of colonial people who were to an increasing degree being inspired and led by Jefferson, sought, for their own partisan purpose, to curb and restrict the development of American democracy. Recognizing that America and France together constituted the vanguard of progress in the world, the Federalists sought to isolate America from its ally so that they might aid and abet the schemes of the crowned heads of Europe to crush democratic France. Hamilton was soon heading the war party of Federalism which not only aimed at breaking French-American friendship but schemed to promote war against France in alliance with the British Tories. Already the Federalists were treading the slippery road of treachery to the nation that was to lead to the outright treason of the Hartford Convention a few short years later.

With both Hamilton, who was emerging as leader of the Federalist war party, and Jefferson, who led the popular masses sympathetic to France and the American-French alliance, as members of his cabinet, Washington to some degree held in restraint this ever-sharpening struggle between Federalists and the republican-democratic forces.

When Washington consulted his cabinet members with regard to issuing the Proclamation of American Neutrality of April 18, 1793, which declared that the United States "should with sincerity and good faith adopt and pursue a conduct friendly and impartial toward the belligerent powers" (Austria, Prussia, Sardinia, the Netherlands and Britain at war with France), Jefferson supported Washington's policy. The Jeffersonians, who fought to throw American influence on the side of France, utilized the Proclamation in an effort to stem the demand of the war party for intervention against France.

Behind the cloak of "neutrality," however, the Tory-hearted defeatists of that day conspired with the enemies of France, and finally against their own country, the United States—dragging the nation away from the policy whose firm foundation had already been laid. That established American foreign policy was one designed to safeguard and preserve the national interest of the United States; it was a policy based upon mutual friendship and alliance with other nations who recognized that their own interests coincided with the interest of the United States; it was a policy of active solidarity with the forces of democracy and progress

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in other lands. In short, it was the kind of policy so resolutely being pursued by America today as represented best in the decisions of Moscow, Cairo and Teheran.

Jefferson could not long remain in Washington's cabinet as Hamilton rapidly became the decisive influence, more and more winning dominance over Washington. Jefferson finally resigned from the cabinet to be freer to organize the struggle against Hamilton that was finally to be crowned with victory in Jefferson's election a few short years later to the Presidency and with the restoration of American foreign policy to the firm basis constructed in earlier years.

It was a Washington whose cabinet was firmly in the grip of Hamilton, a Washington increasingly identified with the Federalists, who pronounced the words of the "Farewell Address" which had been drafted by Alexander Hamilton:

"Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor or caprice? . . ."

" 'Tis our policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world; so far I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it—for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements."

Those words have become the byword of reaction today. But let the nation remember that under cover of this reaffirmation of the neutrality declaration of April, 1793, a reactionary conspiracy with its leadership in Washington's own cabinet sought to carry out a policy of violent partisanship toward Tory Britain and against democratic France. The Address expressed neutrality in words only; in practice it helped to conceal an effort toward *intervention* in Europe *against* democracy. Similarly in our modern day the "isolationists" or "America Firsters" throw the same halo around themselves to cloak a policy directed toward active imperialist intervention by the United States against world democracy and for American imperialist hegemony over the world. Washington's prestige that served the followers of Hamilton as a mask in their conspiracy against the nation is in like manner exploited by the modern prototypes of Hamilton.

Our modern defeatists and reactionaries will find some consolation in the Federalist policy to which Washington's Administration succumbed under Hamilton's dominating influence. They can even rejoice in the fact that the aging Washington was prepared to accept the position of Commander-in-Chief of an American army for war against France and could be drawn into denunciations of the democratic movement and into support of the Alien and Sedition Acts.

But they dare not balance the lifetime of patriotic service to America of George Washington, indomitable military leader and unswerving patriot, against the Washington who permitted his position and prestige to be used by the Federalist cabal against democracy. The balance weighs too heavily in the direction of the former, which earned Washington every right to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the title of a great American statesman and "Father of His Country."

While the "America Firsters" will quote liberally from the "Farewell Address" to misconstrue the basic policy and philosophy of Washington, they will find scant satisfaction in an expression of Washington's attitude as outlined in a letter sent to James Monroe on August 25, 1796, a few weeks before the "Farewell Address," in which he refers to a letter of his that had fallen into French hands. Therein Washington denies that:

". . . it will show in the remotest degree any disposition on my part to favor the British interests in their dispute with France. . . .

"My conduct . . . may be summed up in a few words; that I have always wished well to the French Revolution; that I have always given it as my decided opinion, that no nation had a right to intermeddle in the internal concern of another; that every one had a right to form and adopt whatever government they liked best to live under themselves; and that if this country could, consistently with its engagements, maintain a strict neutrality and thereby, preserve peace, it was bound to do so by motives of policy, interest, and every other consideration, that ought to actuate a people situated and circumstanced as we are, already deeply in debt, and in a convalescent state from the struggle we have been engaged in ourselves." (*Writings*, Volume XIII, p. 263.)

Here again is affirmed the thought of rejecting "entangling alliances," but the outlook of an earlier Washington speaks more clearly than in the "Farewell Address." While Washington here fails to see that "a people situated and circumstanced as we are" could at that time preserve its peace and independence only through alliance and friendship with France, as proposed by the Jeffersonians, against the reaction that sought to crush democracy everywhere, he does boldly insist upon the right of every people to determine its own destiny and to choose its own form of government. Let the Herbert Hoovers, the Tafts, Nyes and Wheelers find any comfort in that thought if they can, for the resistance of these arch-defeatists to the policy of Teheran is fundamentally based upon their insistence that the right of the people of the Soviet Union and of the other nations of the world "to form and adopt whatever government they liked best" be set aside whatever the cost to humanity may be.

Patriotic Americans cannot but feel more proud of the history and tradition of their own nation as we today rediscover the best in that democratic tradition and wield it as a weapon for forging the national unity within America and the unity with all freedom-loving peoples that alone can assure victory and peaceful, orderly progress in the post-war world.

Washington belongs to democratic America, to the America that is determined to follow the path of Teheran. Let us draw strength and inspiration from these great forebears of our nation; and, above all, let us cherish deeply their heritage that it may not be misused and misrepresented by the enemies of our nation and mankind.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LENIN AND THE SOVIET PEOPLE'S PATRIOTIC WAR

BY ZINAIDA SMIRNOVA

VLADIMIR LENIN, the great teacher, leader of the Soviet people and founder of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet State, died twenty years ago. Two decades have elapsed since Lenin's death and the historic significance of Lenin's works and the powerful, creative role of Lenin's teachings have been revealed to the peoples over the whole world.

In two decades of progress along the road which is pointed out by Lenin and under the leadership of Stalin, Lenin's friend, comrade-in-arms and continuer of his cause, the Soviet people have transformed their country into a great power.

During the historic struggle of the freedom-loving peoples against the bitterest enemy of mankind, German fascism, it has fallen to the Soviet Union to stand the hardest trials with which history has ever confronted any peoples or states.

In the course of the grim war, the Soviet State, which was brought into being by the genius of Lenin and Stalin, has revealed its invincible power. Withstanding the most trying ordeals, overcoming tremendous difficulties, the Soviet State has been further strengthened in the course of the war.

The successful struggle of the Soviet people and its Red Army has shown to the world the great significance of Lenin's work, as founder and inspirer of the Soviet power. The greatest successes which have been achieved by the Soviet Union in the present war, the severest of all wars in history, afford striking evidence of the correctness of the path pointed out by Lenin to the peoples of the Soviet country, testimony of the strength and the vitality of Lenin's historic beginnings.

Lenin founded the Soviet State and this state became a great progressive power and a mighty bulwark of the happiness and the glory of the peoples of the Soviet Union. The Soviet State's structure has been built on the principles of a broad and a consistent policy of democracy, which has ensured the unprecedented development of the creative forces of the Soviet peoples.

Carrying Lenin's teachings into practice, the peoples of the Soviet country, led by Stalin, radically changed the appearance of their country, built up a powerful industry and collective agriculture, equipped with the most modern machinery.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviet system revealed itself not only as the best form of organization for the economic and cultural development of the country during the period of peaceful construction, but also as the best form of mobilization of the national forces for the struggle against foreign invaders.

Soviet power enjoys the greatest support of all Soviet peoples, for it is truly a people's power, expressing the will of the people and realizing its desires and aspirations.

The Soviet system has withstood with honor all the tests of war and has revealed itself as a most stable state system.

Lenin founded the Bolshevik Party and this party became the leading and guiding force of the Soviet people, the powerful organizer of all of its forces and inspired all its varied endeavors. The party of Lenin and Stalin gave leadership to the colossal effort of the Soviet people for the transformation of their country during the years of peaceful construction. It roused the peoples of the Soviet Union to the just, patriotic war, mobilized the energy of millions of Soviet people, directing their efforts toward one aim, the winning of victory over the enemy.

Under its leadership, the Soviet people are successfully coping with the difficulties of the war. Soviet patriots, reared by the Bolshevik Party, have revealed in the war examples of mass heroism and legendary exploits, unknown to history.

Not a single party in the world enjoys the prestige and the confidence of the people as does the Bolshevik Party. From history and experience, millions of Soviet people have learned that the Bolshevik Party represents the people's mind and will.

The war has witnessed still further strengthening of the contact between the party and the people, further strengthening the people's love and confidence in the party of Lenin and Stalin. Lenin laid the foundations for the greatest friendship of the peoples of the Soviet country, and this friendship has become the might and source of the strength of the Soviet Union. It is one of the cornerstones of the supporting might of the lands of the Soviets.

For the first time in the world, the great principles of freedom and the equality of all nationalities comprising a state can be found embodied in the Union of Soviet Republics. The strength of the fraternity of the peoples has facilitated the progress of the Soviet State during the years of peaceful construction, transforming the Soviet Union into an invincible fortress in war-time. The friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union has withstood all the hardships and trials of war and has been still further strengthened in the common struggle of the Soviet people against the fascist invaders.

Lenin founded a strong alliance between the working class and the peasantry, which has now been further strengthened on the fronts of this patriotic war against the German invaders and in the selfless labor in the rear.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviet State represents the friendly cooperation between the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia.

Lenin organized the Red Army, which became a loyal defender of the Soviet Union, the beloved child of the Soviet people in the struggle against foreign invaders during the early years of the existence of Soviet power. The Red Army defended the honor, freedom and the independence of its native land and the right of the peoples of the Soviet country to mold their life as was taught by the great Lenin.

The mighty army of the free Soviet people became a force against which the raging avalanche of the fascist armies has smashed itself. The peoples the world over will never forget the historic battle at Moscow, when the Red Army debunked the myth about the invincibility of German troops.

The great battle of Stalingrad marked the end of the German fascist army and will go down as a symbol of the shining glory of Soviet arms.

The year 1943 for the Red Army was like an irresistible wave, which was washing away the foreign scum from its native land and swept hundreds of kilometers westward, trampling the prestige of German arms and forever burying German hopes for defeating the Soviets, it will go down in history as the year of great victories for the Soviet people.

The Red Army founded by Lenin and led by Marshal Stalin has emerged with honor from these grim trials.

Relying on the strong Soviet rear and backed by the affection and the solicitude of the entire Soviet people, the Red Army became tempered and strengthened in the greatest battles of this patriotic war and has acquired fighting experience.

In the person of Stalin, the Red Army has a great army leader who has brilliantly developed Soviet military science, educated a galaxy of talented Soviet generals who have successfully realized the correctness of the strategic plans of the Supreme High Command.

Understanding the noble aims for which the Red Army is waging war, mass heroism and readiness to go to death for the freedom of their country were born in the ranks of the Red Army. Strengthened and hardened in battle, armed with first-rate equipment and having learned to hit the enemy without missing, thanks to its high morale, its soldiers and officers are supremely devoted to its people and the Red Army is now the most powerful, seasoned modern army.

During the past year, the Red Army has brought about a radical change in the course of the war. Great victories have been won by the Red Army which have drastically worsened the economic, political and military situation of fascist Germany, confronting her with catastrophe.

The Soviet Union is shouldering the main brunt of the struggle against the Hitlerite fascist hordes, which menace all the great achievements of mankind and the very existence of free peoples. By its heroic struggle against the fascist en-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slavers, the Soviet Union has won international prestige and the deep respect of all the democratic peoples and countries.

The powerful anti-Hitlerite coalition, led by the great world powers, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and the United States, has been formed and strengthened in the course of the war.

The recent conference of the leaders of the three Allied powers in Teheran gave striking evidence of the steadily growing stability of the Anglo-Soviet-American fighting alliance, which is constantly broadening the collaboration of the three great powers. The historic decisions of this conference testify to the unbending determination of the Allied powers to strike joint blows at the enemy.

The conference has approved of plans and dates of the decisive operations which are aimed at the destruction of the German armed forces. The victory of the Allied countries over the common enemy has been brought nearer, while the Hitlerite cause is irrevocably lost.

The Soviet people have received the decisions of the Teheran confrence with the greatest satisfaction and are mobilizing their forces to win complete victory over the German invaders. The peoples of the Soviet country know that the destiny of generations is being decided in the great battles of this patriotic war.

In the Soviet Union's heroic struggle against the Hitlerite invaders, the Soviet people and the Red Army have been inspired by the spirit of the great Lenin, the brilliant teacher of the Soviet people, who gave all of his noble life to the cause of the freedom and the happiness of his people.

Through the thunder of war gleams Lenin's immortal banner, proudly streaming over the land of the Soviets. This banner has been borne by the great Stalin, the leader of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the wise captain of the armed forces of the Soviet country. Under the banner of Lenin, led by Stalin, the people are marching toward victory.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POLAND AND THE COMING STAGE OF THE WAR

BY EUGENE TARLE

THE moment for which the Polish people have been waiting impatiently, liberation from the Hitlerite yoke, is approaching. It turns out, however, that there are still Poles who have not yet made the choice with whom to go: Hitler or the Soviet Union. At any rate this is still a "problem" for the emigré Polish Government and the reactionary circles supporting it. Their position is most clearly expressed by the newspaper *Wiadomosci Codzienny*, which, on November 7, declared that if the Red Army enters Poland without previously renouncing its claims to the "Eastern Districts," that is, the districts of Vilno, Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia, "the Polish underground movement will fight against the Red Army just as ruthlessly as against the German aggressor."

Under the high-sounding title, "the Polish Underground Movement," the paper, of course, had in mind not the movement of Polish guerrilla patriots, but a handful of organizations backing the emigré government and carrying out its directives. Such is the quite logical conclusion to be drawn from all the constant statements of Mikolajczyk's Cabinet members, as well as the Polish papers supporting this cabinet.

The Soviet people are fighting against the Hitlerite invaders — the executioners of Poland. The Soviet public expects the creation of a new, strong, democratic Poland to be one of the results of the victory over Hitler Germany. However, neither the calculations of Hitlerite propaganda nor the program of reactionary elements among the Polish emigrés are by any means inclined to permit the unhindered normal development of the friendly, allied relations natural to peoples conducting a common struggle. A campaign of slander of the most monstrous and absurdly incredible accusations has been launched against the Soviet Union. The Polish emigré press did not trouble to conceal its disappointment when it stated that British public opinion maintains a dead silence with regard to the most "pathetic" Polish reports and the most sensational accusations.

* * *

The Mikolajczyk Government has been formed. The appointment of the arrant fascist, General Sosn-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kowski, as commander-in-chief of the Polish Army opened an entirely new era, hailed by the whole Hitlerite press, an era of systematic murder of Polish guerrillas by a Polish hand, with the direct, open, official encouragement and incitement on the part of Sosnkowski and his agents.

These incredible events taking place in Poland have given full right, not only to the British, but also to the American press, to ask General Sosnkowski point blank: What orders will he issue through his broadcasting station *Swit*, to his gangs at the inevitable moment when the Soviet Army, pursuing the retreating Germans, enters Poland?

It must be admitted that the question—With the Germans or with the Soviet Union?—is now facing every Pole in all its sharpness. We have no doubt, of course, that the Poland whose representatives are heroically fighting on our front, overjoyed at having set foot on the Warsaw Highway, has irrevocably made its choice.

When we speak of present-day Poland we also know that now the Messrs. Sosnkowskis are murdering Polish guerrillas fighting against Hitler—precisely the guerrillas who are the heralds of a better future and of all the hopes of their people. We understand that for every Lukasiewicz or Matuszewski and their ilk, lounging in cozy London and New York cafes, spilling their vile absurd intrigues, there are dozens like Lieutenant Czarkowski and other heroes of the Kosciuszko Division, giving their life for Poland's cause.

Apart from their "moral" qualities the maneuvers of some London emigrés are above all absurd. Is it possible for a person in full possession of his senses and memory even to raise the question, With whom should Poland go: with Hitler or the Soviet Union? Is it possible for a Pole not suffering from a completely phenomenal lack of understanding (or without direct instructions from Berlin) energetically to agitate against the Second Front and frankly voice fear of the Red Army's victories? These men, ten minutes short of Quislings, even lie like genuine Quislings and Lavals in official positions.

Laval calls the Hitlerite invasion of Russia "Europe's rising against Bolshevism," while Ignatz Matuszewski and his ilk also speak of the "struggle against Bolshevism" as the central political task on the agenda. And since "Bolshevism" has already thrown the Germans beyond the Dnieper and in a day or two will fling them farther west, the conclusion for the Messrs. Matuszewskis is quite clear.

When Joseph Beck, having safely deposited Poland in Hitler's hands, modestly betook himself to Rumania for rest from his labors, maintaining the strictest incognito en route, few recalled the fervor with which Beck, some time ago, joined the "Anticomintern Pact" the moment Berlin beckoned.

But to repeat Beck's phraseology with such exact precision today in London is possible only in the hope that Englishmen will not understand Polish.

However, to write articles in emi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gration far from war is one thing and to practice Beck's policy in Poland proper in 1943 or even 1944 is far more difficult, and doomed to failure. For the Polish people, having spent four years and still languishing in the Hitlerite prison, differs in mentality from its "government" and others of its "well-wishers," who are watching Poland from their beautiful far-away.

The frantic German beast, who humiliated Poland as no other country, hoped that he would succeed with the aid of reactionary Polish emigrés in driving a wedge between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-Saxon powers. He failed; but he succeeded in something else: he proved with the utmost clarity to all Poles with common sense that Poland has no choice and that there is only one possible solution of the question.

To go with Hitler is to share the fate of Hitler Germany. To remain "neutral" means also to go with Hitler. The only way open is the one taken by the Czarkowskis and now followed by their comrades: Following this way they have already entered upon the Warsaw Highway moving toward their land, and they will go farther, spreading and broadening the old (and even the oldest) western frontiers of their motherland, overtaking their criminal enemies in their brigand lair.

This they can do only in close comradely unity with the Red Army and they have already sanctified this unity with their noble blood.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MOST IMPORTANT STAGE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE U.S.S.R. AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA*

THE treaty signed between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia is the natural continuation of the friendly cooperation of the two countries, both prior to the war as well as during the war against Germany.

This cooperation has now been extended to the post-war period. The policy of friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia has always been in keeping with the striving and fundamental interests of the Soviet and Czechoslovak peoples who are motivated by deep and mutual sympathy.

The statesmen of Czechoslovakia and above all its President Benes have repeatedly proclaimed the Czechoslovak peoples' vital interest in the friendship and support of the great Soviet State.

The Soviet Union, for its part, has invariably displayed sympathy for the aspirations of the Czechoslovak peoples. The clear, firm and consistent policy of the U.S.S.R. towards its state of independence and security has been expressed in many diplomatic acts.

As far back as 1935, when the danger of German aggression loomed in Europe, the U.S.S.R. concluded a mutual assistance pact with Czechoslovakia, in the event of their being the "object of threats or in danger of attack by any European state."

It is known that the policy of curbing German aggression, as expressed in this pact (as in a number of others), was not at the time given the necessary support by the governments of the other European states.

Despite the U.S.S.R.'s readiness to "take part in collective operations which would be resolved upon together with it, and which would aim at checking the further development of aggression and eliminate the growing danger of a new world slaughter" the European "appeasers" and the Germans surrendered Czechoslovakia in Munich to be devoured by Hitler.

The Soviet Union was the only state which did not recognize the Munich agreement, which now in the course of the war has been annulled by the other countries.

* * *

The national tragedy of Czechoslovakia has evoked the warm sympathy of the Soviet people.

The world war, unleashed by the German imperialist invaders has

* An editorial in *Izvestia*, Moscow, December 14, 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still further united our peoples and is making them participants in a common struggle.

The treaty between the governments of the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia on the point of operations in the war against the Germans was signed in London on July 18, 1941.

The Soviet Government agreed to the formation of national Czechoslovak army units on the territory of the Soviet Union and these units are fighting with honor under the Soviet command and shoulder to shoulder with the Red Army.

The first foreigner to receive the high title of Hero of the Soviet Union was the Czech Senior Lieutenant, Otakar Jaros.

The Soviet people, many of whose towns and villages have been destroyed by the German invaders, are able to understand better than anybody else the tragedy of the Czechoslovak village of Lidice.

The Soviet people, who have sent into the rear of the German invaders hundreds of thousands of people's avengers—the partisans — are able to appreciate better than anybody else what the shot fired by Czech partiots at the Hitlerite Gauleiter Heydrich meant.

Fifty thousand Czechoslovak citizens have been executed by the German butchers, 200,000 Czechs are languishing in concentration camps—this tragic list of victims of the Hitlerite terror in Czechoslovakia shows that the Czechoslovak people will not submit to the invaders.

The great victories of the Red Army over the German armed forces as well as the successes of the Allied troops and finally the historic decisions at the recent conference of the leaders of the three Allied powers in Teheran, has brought closer the day of victory over Germany and the successful completion of the war and triumph for the United Nations cause.

* * *

The war is reaching its culmination point, the tragedy of the Czechoslovak people is coming to an end.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia have considered it necessary at the present stage of the war to confirm and to supplement the existing relations between them with a new treaty which expresses their desire to "help support the peace after the war and to prevent further aggression by Germany and to ensure a lasting friendship and post-war peaceful cooperation between the two nations."

The treaty has been signed over a period of twenty years and is one of those political documents which will have a great significance also in post-war Europe.

The significance of the treaty lies also in the fact that it determines the nature of the relations of the U.S.S.R. with the smaller countries which are taking a part in the common struggle against German imperialism.

The principles of mutual respect for the independence and the sovereignty of the contracting parties and the non-interference in the internal affairs of the other state are expressed in an article of our treaty and forms the basis for these relations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is also the basis for more extensive development of economic relations and every possible economic assistance to each other after the war.

The treaty confirms the first and foremost obligation, "to render to each other military, and every other kind of assistance and give every form of support in the present war against Germany and all those states that are linked with her in acts of aggression in Europe." Secondly, the extension of the principle of mutual assistance in the post-war period for the purpose of preventing new aggression by Germany.

In his November report, Stalin pointed out that among the tasks which the Soviet Union will have to carry out together with her Allies, one of the prime tasks will be that of establishing such an order in Europe as will completely preclude the possibility of new aggression by Germany.

The victory over Germany would be incomplete and the achieved peace unstable without such an order in Europe.

History has shown that the broken claws of the German beast are able to grow back. German imperialism has already caused two world wars and all the champions of peace are agreed that Germany must be deprived of the possibility for causing a third such war.

Article Three of the treaty answers this task. The states which have tasted the disasters of the German "Drang nach Osten" agree in advance to act jointly in the event of a post-war Germany renewing such a policy. By collective security measures they will forestall the possible rebirth of German aggression, in this case, in the east.

Germany must be deprived of the chance to encroach on foreign soils and countries, no matter where they are situated—in the west, or in the east, in the south or in the north.

The new Soviet - Czechoslovak treaty takes into account the special hankering of the German imperialists for the "eastern area," for lands of the Slav peoples.

Hence, the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty is aimed at preventing the very possibility and the repetition of such attempts on the part of German imperialism, whose enmity for the Slav people is expressed most viciously in this war.

A similar obligation of mutual assistance and support in the event of a new war of German aggression is contained in the Anglo-Soviet treaty.

Consequently, the present treaty with Czechoslovakia constitutes an important link in the collective system of the future security of European countries.

The community interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia are the foundation for their durable and cordial friendship.

The development of these friendly relations between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia who have a common border, together with strengthening the relations between all the freedom-loving peoples in Europe, and not the fantastic plans of an artificial "federation of small states in Europe," can give the people a just and lasting peace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty is a concrete expression of the will of the peoples to live in continual friendship and cooperation in the common struggle against the robber, German fascism, and also after the war in helping each other in a peaceful prosperity, which no fear for their existence or threat of a new attack by Germany could upset.

* * *

The protocol attached to the treaty provides for any other third country, bordering with the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia and the object of German aggression in this war, joining this treaty if it so desires.

The treaty is important in this historical stage and in the development of the traditional friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia.

The strengthening of this friendship and the fighting cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia is in the interest of all freedom-loving people who are striving to hasten the debacle of Hitlerite Germany and to establish a durable peace in the post-war Europe.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORGING NEGRO-WHITE UNITY

BY JOHN PITTMAN

(Continued from the January issue)

III.

HOW does it happen that, despite the growth of unity among the people, despite their mobilization to prosecute successfully the war for the destruction of Hitlerism, such fifth-column activities are able to continue? How does it happen, after such nationwide demonstrations of unity among the masses of the people, that Hitler's agents are still able to incite riots and attacks against Negroes, Jews, Mexican-Americans?

One reason is the failure of local and state authorities and Federal law enforcement agencies to root out and punish the fifth column provocateurs and hoodlums, or to attempt to educate the people regarding the danger of these forces. The chief offender in this respect is the Attorney General of the United States, Francis Biddle, who has not only turned a deaf ear to the din of demands for action against the riot instigators, but has actually given these forces encouragement to continue their activities in other cities. Conspicuous among these acts of encouragement to the fifth column has been Biddle's refusal to prosecute the Klan, Black Legion, National Workers League, and National Rifle Club elements behind the attacks on Detroit's Negro population. Six Nazi spies were recently arrested in Detroit, two of whom were members of the National Workers League — Mrs. Theresa Beherens and Dr. Fred W. Thomas, affiliated with Parker Sage, Garland Alderman, and Virgil Chandler, all of the National Workers League and already under indictment for their instigation of the bloody Sojourner Truth attack on Negroes, February 28, 1942. Despite this direct link with fifth column elements, Biddle clings to his contention that the Detroit outbreak was the result of "tension" caused by "objective conditions" of "deteriorating relations" between Negroes and whites.

How this policy has encouraged the fifth column to continue its activities may be seen in the recent Klan support of the re-election of Mayor Jeffries of Detroit. The Mayor himself conducted a campaign based on Negro-baiting, which is not surprising in view of his complicity with the Republican Governor of Michigan, Prosecutor Dowling, Police Commissioner Witherspoon and other public officials in whitewashing the role of the fifth column in the riot, rejecting the popular demand for a grand jury investigation, and turning the blame for the outbreak upon the Negro people themselves. Backed by the Klan, and with his chief rival tending to capitulate before the Negro-baiters, Jeffries won re-election with the support of the Ford Motor

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Company and all the fascist organizations in Detroit.

Nor did Attorney General Biddle take action in response to demands from the Los Angeles citizens' committees for investigation of the Axis-inspired attacks on the Mexican-American youth. He was silent, along with Republican Governor Thomas Dewey, on the Hillburn, N. Y. school outrage, although one of the leaders of the anti-Negro incitement admitted publicly that subsidies from private and wealthy sources (the name of the wealthy fifth-columnist, John B. Snow, was implicated) were being paid for the tuition of poor white children whose parents, influenced by the anti-Negro incitement, removed them from the public school and sent them to expensive private institutions. Biddle has also refused to investigate the Boston pogrom, instigated by the Christian Front hoodlums, and denounced by Governor Saltonstall and the Bishop of Boston as fascist activity. Biddle has done nothing to rectify the outrageous situation in which repeated attacks are being carried out on Negro soldiers by hoodlums around army camps throughout the country. His example sets the pattern of behavior for state and local law enforcement officers, while giving a green light to the fifth column to continue its work of undermining the country's war effort.

Alarming, therefore, is the remissness of local legislatures and public officials in various parts of the country with regard to this vital issue.

For example, the New York City Council, on October 5, rejected a resolution offered by Communist Councilman Peter V. Cacchione calling for an investigation of groups and individuals inciting to racial and religious antagonism. The Mayor of San Francisco, urged by citizens' committees to make war-housing available for incoming Negro workers, demanded that the federal government "stop the Negro invasion" of the city! The Mayor of Los Angeles, urged to take action against the Klan and other fifth-column elements, proclaimed that these activities were magnified, and that "objective conditions" were alone to blame for the "deteriorating relations" between Negroes and whites. Apparently it is nothing to these public officials that behind these outbreaks are all the identifying signs of the Axis fifth column—anti-Negroism, anti-Semitism, Red-baiting — in short, the unmistakable brand of agents of the "anti-Komintern," under cover of which the Axis powers launched their aggressions and depredations against all peace-loving peoples.

What, then, is the role of the so-called "objective conditions," by which public officials and many well-meaning people unwittingly exonerate the fifth column, presumably blaming the attacks on racial prejudice, segregation, and other minorities? Do these conditions play a contributing role in the Axis-incited riots?

Undoubtedly so. The very existence of these conditions is incompatible with the successful prosecution of the war against Hitlerism. They are obstacles to the fullest mobilization of the people, utilization of the country's resources and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development of national morale and unity. Hence, the fifth column is able to enlist them in its treacherous activity. It organizes activity to perpetuate and extend these conditions. It plays upon the residuum of racial prejudice in American life to mobilize and direct forces to halt the changes in these conditions which the country's war effort imperatively requires.

The processes of war mobilization and of war production exert a powerful pressure upon these conditions of segregation and discrimination, forcing their alteration and diminution. But the fifth column organizes a counter-pressure to maintain them in accordance with the Axis aim of preventing the country from fully entering into the military operations of the Allied coalition. When the needs of military mobilization imperatively demand the termination of segregation in the armed forces and war plants, the fifth column organizes resistance to this change. When the same needs cry for adequate housing, recreation and education for Negroes, the fifth column organizes violent attacks and "race riots" to block this housing and recreation.

Thus it is that these conditions of segregation and discrimination against Negroes and other minorities strike a blow at the American people and the nation's victory drive. They hinder the war effort by their very existence. They impair the confidence requisite for national unity. They supply the fifth column with dynamite for creating explosions in the centers of war production. They violate the very nature and purpose of this people's war by imposing indignities upon a section of the American people. Consequently, the eradication of anti-Negro practices is a prime immediate necessity of the American people's struggle for victory in the war.

Every organization of the masses of the Negro people has stressed the necessity for this step. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Negro Congress, the Urban League, the National Council of Negro Women, the Negro press, the Negro church, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, and thousands of local Negro fraternal, trade union, and civic organizations throughout America —all have insisted on the necessity of removing these obstacles to the war effort. And increasing numbers of the white population of America are joining in these demands, especially the trade unions, with the C.I.O. in the forefront, who recognize more clearly than any other section of the people the danger of fascism and the country's stake in victory in the war. Unfortunately in its plot to maintain these obstacles and to exacerbate their influence for disunity, the fifth column is able to make use of some honestly patriotic people, who are misled or infected with the virus of racial prejudice.

Though the War and Navy Departments have found their initial policy of segregation in the armed forces completely incompatible with the needs of an army and navy capable of inflicting powerful blows on the enemy, elements within both departments resist these necessary changes. The directive to Negro troops stationed at Camp Stewart,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Georgia, issued by Brigadier-General E. A. Stockton, is a case in point. This directive ordered Negro soldiers to remember their slave ancestry and to behave as they had been taught by the Dixie Bourbon slave-masters! Though the case was brought to the attention of Secretary of War Stimson, the War Department has not yet censured or criticized the General, or repudiated his orders. Such an attitude by the War Department has encouraged local and state government agencies, transportation companies, and places of public accommodation to stand pat in their policies of segregation and discrimination. More serious, it has given Axis agents the opportunity of inciting hoodlum attacks on Negro soldiers.

The cumulative effect of this resistance to the changes demanded by the requirements of war mobilization has been a profound blow to the morale of the Negro people, which has also affected all other sections of the population and the armed forces. It was in recognition of this injury to the country's unity and preparations for the offensive that the National Negro Congress established a lobby in Washington and formulated a program to end discrimination in the armed forces. Needless to say, such a program is in the interest of all the American people. It is as necessary for total victory over Hitlerism as a defeat inflicted on the enemy on the battlefield.

A similar pattern is evident in relation to the opposition to the improvement of living conditions and discriminatory civil and political barriers to the full participation of the Negroes and other minorities in the war effort. The Sojourner Truth outrage in Detroit is a case in point. Though the efficient contribution of Negro war workers required their accommodation in decent housing, the fifth column played upon existing prejudices to organize violence against Negroes. In a recent legislative supplement to its monthly bulletin, the N.A.A.C.P. called attention to the role of "northern Republicans and southern Democrats" in scrapping legislation necessary to integrate Negroes in the war mobilization. It branded the inadequate funds appropriated to the Farm Security Administration, the emasculation of the National Resources Planning Board, the scrapping of the National Youth Administration, the proposed dismissal of William Pickens on charges preferred by the Dies Committee, and the sabotage of President Roosevelt's price roll-back and subsidy program as acts adversely affecting the Negro people and the country's war program. And the N.A.A.C.P. organ stressed the harmful effects of the poll tax in keeping in office the obstructionists of integrating the Negro people in the national unity and of promoting the nation's war effort as a whole.

The current clamor about a shortage of manpower emphasizes a fourth major condition which hinders full war production and provides the Axis fifth column with opportunities to incite riots. This condition is employer resistance to war production demands that the country's available manpower re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sources be fully utilized. This resistance manifests itself in the opposition to the employment of women, and especially in the refusal, generally, to employ Negroes in any but the lowest-paid menial jobs or to promote them on the basis of skill and efficiency. Despite President Roosevelt's issuance of Executive Orders 8802 and 9346 establishing the Fair Employment Practice Committee, despite the Committee's valuable work, despite acute labor shortages in key industrial and agricultural areas, despite these favorable factors and conditions, a far too considerable section today still opposes the full integration of Negroes, Jews, Mexican-Americans, Chinese-Americans and other minority people into war industry. The Public Affairs Committee pamphlet, *The Negro and the War*, by Earl Brown and George R. Leighton, contains some statistics on this matter:

"In reply to a query sent out in January, 1942, by the United States Employment Service to hundreds of industrialists with large war contracts as to whether they would employ Negroes, 51 per cent of them stated that they did not and would not, and only half of the remainder stated that they would hire them without any ifs, ands, and buts. This was six months after President Roosevelt had issued an executive order prohibiting discrimination in war industries.

"The survey, concentrated on regions with considerable Negro labor, revealed that, of 282,245 openings, 144,538 (51 per cent) were barred to Negroes as a matter of policy. It also showed only a minor difference between hiring practices involving Negroes in the North and in the South. In Texas, of 17,435 defense jobs, 9,117 were prohibited to Negroes; in Michigan, 22,042 of 26,904; in Indiana, 9,331 of 9,979; in Ohio, 29,242 of 34,861. Not only were Negroes discriminated against in skilled jobs but also in unskilled ones. For of 83,000 unskilled jobs, 35,000 were closed to Negroes."

Nor could management claim as an excuse for this policy the old slur against the industry and efficiency of Negroes. The Brown-Leighton pamphlet continues:

"Late in 1941, the National Industrial Conference Board published the results of an investigation of such experiences. Asked to rank white and colored workers on comparable skilled and semi-skilled work, 102 firms which hired both colored and white workers, reported as follows: as to ability and skill, seventy firms rated Negro workers equal to white workers; thirty-one, poorer; one, better. As to production, eighty-five firms found Negroes equal to; twelve, poorer than; and five, better than white workers. Concerning regularity of attendance, sixty-four firms reported Negroes to be equal to; thirty-two, poorer; and five, better than white workers."

In the year or more since the survey was made, some integration of Negroes into war industry has occurred. About a million were employed in war plants last summer, most of whom entered during the last half of 1942 and the first quarter of 1943. Yet, management refuses to upgrade and promote these workers to positions commensurate with their skill and efficiency.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While a survey undertaken by the magazine *Fortune* in February, 1943, showed that fewer than 30 per cent of 5,000 leading industrialists even at the time employed as much as 10 per cent Negro labor, while more than a third believed no Negroes could be used in their plants. Needless to say, this attitude has been partly responsible for the dislocations in war industry resulting from such created labor shortages. It has contributed to delays in the mobilization of the country's resources for victory.

Yet, efforts of the Administration to change this condition have met with furious opposition and outright sabotage by the same reactionary forces who utilize this condition as a political weapon against the Administration, or as a pretext for anti-Negro incitement. When the F.E.P.C. went into the Birmingham area to hold hearings on anti-Negro discrimination, Alabama's Governor Dixon—a kinsman of the man who wrote *The Klansman,* that incendiary and scurrilous defamation of Negroes—and a politician named Horace A. Wilkinson organized a "White Supremacy League." A delegation of six poll-tax Senators gave President Roosevelt an ultimatum threatening to reject all Administration legislation unless the hearings were abandoned. Recently, however, the President's F.E.P.C. condemned 23 railroads for discriminatory practices in regard to employment of Negro workers. Following the adamant rejection of the F.E.P.C. ruling by 19 southern railroads, the case now is in the hands of the President for action.

In addition to its opposition to the employment of Negroes, industrial management sometimes resorts to the incitement of violence against efforts of Negro and white workers to obtain better wages and working conditions for the Negro workers. Thus, the company union fighting the United Auto Workers at the Glenn L. Martin aircraft plant in Baltimore passed out inflammatory anti-Negro leaflets, which, however, failed to prevent an overwhelming vote in the N.L.R.B., election for the U.A.W.

Such continued obstruction of this urgent need for fair employment practices toward all American workers finds comfort in the policies of certain state and local governments. Thus, the shortage of farm labor in some parts of the United States, although resulting partly from the failure to utilize labor efficiently in certain farm areas, might have been relieved by the use of Negro farm workers had not some Southern towns and counties passed laws prohibiting the departure of Negroes from their localities. The difficulty in obtaining Mexican workers is partly attributable to such practices as those of San Bernardino, Calif., whose authorities admittedly passed a law in violation of the U. S. Constitution, barring Mexican people from parks, playgrounds and swimming pools.

The injury to the war effort resulting from these practices of many big employers, with the support of reactionary representatives in Congress and in state and local governments, has aroused the anxiety of the labor movement. One of the most encouraging de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

velopments of the recent period has been labor's growing initiative in the fight to destroy racial barriers in industry. Yet labor's fight is seriously weakened, and labor's influence in bringing about the necessary changes is unquestionably lessened, by the persistence of anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, anti-Chinese and anti-Mexican attitudes on the part of a section of the labor movement's leadership. The continued Jim-Crow practices of a number of A. F. of L. affiliates and of the Railroad Brotherhoods militate against labor's efforts to achieve increased production and strengthened unity of all Americans. By rejecting the applications of Negro workers, or by segregating them in auxiliaries where they receive no union benefits while having to pay the same dues as white unionists, these international and local unions stand in the way of the full economic and social integration of the Negro people in the national unity and give aid to the bitterest enemies of both labor and the Negro people. These enemies seize upon such policies to launch company unions, pass restrictive labor laws, foment strikes and incite violence againts the victims of the discriminatory practices, on the pretext that they are threatening trade unionism. For instance, it was the accomplices of John L. Lewis who issued virulent anti-Semitic leaflets in the name of the "Remington-Rand Organizing Committee of District 50." The Klan and Gerald K. Smith have enthusiastically endorsed the policies of the Machinists' and Boilermakers' internationals, which bar Negroes from membership or segregate them in auxiliaries. Tokio and Berlin could not but applaud when the thirteen old men of the A. F. of L. Executive Board, in the national convention at Boston in October, attacked the bill to repeal the insulting and chauvinistic Chinese Exclusion Act, and, after denouncing the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters' delegates for pleading for practical action to lift anti-Negro bans and abolish Jim-Crow branches, again passed the threadbare resolution reaffirming the A. F. of L.'s stand for "equality." Only through the most ruthless struggle against this infection within its own ranks can the labor movement overcome the defeatist-inspired hindrances to full manpower utilization.

IV.

Several favorable conditions exist at the present time for accomplishing these tasks. The opportunity for decisively defeating the fifth column has been greatly extended by the new world situation resulting from the extraordinary success of the Red Army and the Moscow and Teheran conferences. In addition, in the recent period, President Roosevelt has issued several declarations which can become valuable weapons in the fight on the fifth column's incitement of attacks on Negroes, Jews, Mexican-Americans and all other minorities. These include his statement pledging the independence of the Philippines as soon as those islands have been liberated from Japanese rule; his appeal to Congress to accord to the people of Puerto Rico the right to elect their own, native Governor;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his appeal to Congress for the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act; and his statement for transmission to the Argentine Government denouncing as "obviously anti-Semitic in nature" its act of suspending Jewish newspapers.

Further, the definite measures in the direction of improving the economic, social and political position of the Negro people will undoubtedly strengthen their possibilities of fuller participation in the nation's drive for victory. In connection with this, a noticeable development of unity among the Negro and minority peoples has occurred.

Negro and white unity is growing among all sections of the American people, and to an extent among the armed forces, especially those that are experiencing close contact with the peoples of many lands. Despite a considerable residuum of racial prejudice and the persistence of segregation in the armed forces, white troops, thrown into combat alongside Negro soldiers by exigencies of military operations, begin to aquire new attitudes toward their comrades-in-arms.

Important is the growing initiative of labor unions in demanding the full integration of the Negro people and other minorities in the war effort and in calling for the crushing of the fifth columnists. This development is the result of a growth of sentiment for more democracy within the labor movement. It has most notably been reflected in such developments as the national C.I.O.'s program for victory. Another indication of labor's growing initiative in behalf of the Negroes and other minorities was the fact that the Negro people voted preponderantly on the same current with labor in the recent November elections. This election stand of Negroes was also a reflection of the fact that they realize the Roosevelt war program, despite vacillations and outright retreat by some Administration officials on the issue of Negro rights, is committed to a policy of integrating the Negro people into the country's wartime activity as a necessary requirement for victory.

But the most decisive condition favoring the continued growth of Negro-white unity, and of national unity, is the driving power which the new international and national situation has given the spur of military necessity. In order to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the setbacks which the Moscow and Teheran Conferences and the Allied armies have inflicted on the Axis, all efforts to speed and complete the total mobilization of the people are urgently necessary. The call to victory is imperative and powerful, and the American people cannot longer tolerate the Axis-inspired insurrectionary activities, the intolerable social and economic conditions imposed on minorities, the conspiratorial racist activities of divisive forces in the ranks of the people.

With such favorable conditions, labor, the Negro people, other minorities and all national unity forces of all classes have the task of forging unity and supporting President Roosevelt's program for an early victory over both Hitler and Hirohito, and of our country's full participation in efforts to achieve a durable, collective peace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORIC DOCUMENTS

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, JANUARY 11, 1943

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:

This nation in the past two years has become an active partner in the world's greatest war against human slavery.

We have joined with likeminded people in order to defend ourselves in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule.

But I do not think that any of us Americans can be content with mere survival. Sacrifices that we and our allies are making impose upon us all a sacred obligation to see to it that out of this war we and our children will gain something better than survival.

We are united in determination that this war shall not be followed by another interim which leads to new disaster—that we shall not repeat the tragic errors of ostrich isolationism—that we shall not repeat the excesses of the wild Twenties when this nation went for a joy ride on a roller coaster which ended in a tragic crash.

When Mr. Hull went to Moscow in October, and when I went to Cairo and Teheran in November, we knew that we were in agreement with our allies in our common determination to fight and win this war. But there were many vital questions concerning the future peace, and they were discussed in an atmosphere of complete candor and harmony.

In the last war such discussions, such meetings, did not even begin until the shooting had stopped and the delegates began to assemble at the peace table. There had been no previous opportunities for man-to-man discussions which lead to meetings of minds. The result was a peace which was not a peace.

That was a mistake which we are not repeating in this war.

And right here I want to address a word or two to some suspicious souls who are fearful that Mr. Hull or I have made "commitments" for the future which might pledge this nation to secret treaties, or to enacting the role of Santa Claus.

To such suspicious souls—using a polite terminology—I wish to say that Mr. Churchill and Marshal Stalin and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek are all thoroughly conversant with the provisions of our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constitution. And so is Mr. Hull. And so am I.

Of course, we made some commitments. We most certainly committed ourselves to very large and very specific military plans which require the use of all Allied forces to bring about the defeat of our enemies at the earliest possible time.

But there were no secret treaties or political or financial commitments.

The one supreme objective for the future, which we discussed for each nation individually, and for all the United Nations, can be summed up in one word: Security.

And that means not only physical security which provides safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security—in a family of nations.

In the plain down-to-earth talks that I had with the Generalissimo and Marshal Stalin and Prime Minister Churchill it was abundantly clear that they are all most deeply interested in the resumption of peaceful progress by their own peoples—progress toward a better life. All our allies want freedom to develop their lands and resources, to build up industry, to increase education and individual opportunity and to raise standards of living.

All our allies have learned by bitter experience that real development will not be possible if they are to be diverted from their purposes by repeated wars—or even threats of war.

China and Russia are truly united with Britain and America in recognition of this essential fact:

The best interests of each nation, large and small, demand that all freedom-loving nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace. In the present world situation, evidenced by the actions of Germany, Italy and Japan, unquestioned military control over disturbers of the peace is as necessary among nations as it is among citizens in a community. And an equally basic essential to peace is a decent standard of living for all individual men and women and children in all nations. Freedom from fear is eternally linked with freedom from want.

There are people who burrow through our nation like unseeing moles, and attempt to spread the suspicion that if other nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living, our own American standard of living must of necessity be depressed.

The fact is the very contrary. It has been shown time and again that if the standard of living of any country goes up, so does its purchasing power—and that such a rise encourages a better standard of living in neighboring countries with whom it trades. That is just plain common sense—and it is the kind of plain common sense that provided the basis for our discussions at Moscow, Cairo and Teheran.

Returning from my journeyings, I must confess to a sense of "let-down" when I found many evidences of faulty perspective here

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Washington. The faulty perspective consists in overemphasizing lesser problems and thereby underemphasizing the first and greatest problem.

The overwhelming majority of our people have met the demands of this war with magnificent courage and understanding. They have accepted inconveniences; they have accepted hardships; they have accepted tragic sacrifices. And they are ready and eager to make whatever further contributions are needed to win the war as quickly as possible—if only they are given the chance to know what is required of them.

However, while the majority goes on about its great work without compaint, a noisy minority maintains an uproar of demands for special favors for special groups. There are pests who swarm through the lobbies of the Congress and the cocktail bars of Washington, representing these special groups as opposed to the basic interests of the nation as a whole. They have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for themselves at the expense of their neighbors—profits in money or in terms of political or social preferment.

Such selfish agitation can be highly dangerous in wartime. It creates confusion. It damages morale. It hampers our national effort. It muddies the waters, and therefore prolongs the war.

If we analyze American history impartially, we cannot escape the fact that in our past we have not always forgotten individual and selfish and partisan interests in time of war—we have not always been united in purpose and direction. We cannot overlook the serious dissensions and the lack of unity in our War of the Revolution, in our War of 1812, in our War Between the States, when the survival of the Union itself was at stake.

In the First World War we came closer to national unity than in any previous war. But that war lasted only a year and a half, and increasing signs of unity began to appear during the final months of the conflict.

In this war we have been compelled to learn how dependent upon each other are all groups and sections of the population of America.

Increased food costs, for example, will bring new demands for wage increases from all war workers, which will in turn raise all prices of all things, including those things which the farmers themselves have to buy. Increased wages or prices will each in turn produce the same results. They all have a particularly disastrous result on all fixed income groups.

And I hope you will remember that all of us in this Government represent the fixed income group just as much as we represent business owners, workers and farmers. This group of fixed-income people include: teachers, clergy, policemen, firemen, widows and minors on fixed incomes, wives and dependents of our soldiers and sailors, and old age pensioners. They and their fami-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lies add up to one-quarter of our 130,000,000 people. They have few or no high pressure representatives at the Capitol. In a period of gross inflation they would be the worst sufferers.

If ever there was a time to subordinate individual or group selfishness to the national good, that time is now. Disunity at home—bickerings, self-seeking partisanship, stoppages of work, inflation, business as usual, politics as usual, luxury as usual—these are the influences which can undermine the morale of the brave men ready to die at the front for us here.

Those who are doing most of the complaining are not deliberately striving to sabotage the national war effort. They are laboring under the delusion that the time is past when we must make prodigious sacrifices —that the war is already won and we can begin to slacken off. But the dangerous folly of that point of view can be measured by the distance that separates our troops from their ultimate objectives in Berlin and Tokyo—and by the sum of all the perils that lie along the way.

Overconfidence and complacency are among our deadliest enemies. Last spring—after notable victories at Stalingrad and in Tunisia and against U-boats on the high seas—overconfidence became so pronounced that war production fell off. In two months, June and July, 1943, more than a thousand airplanes that could have been made and should have been made were not made. Those who failed to make them were not on strike. They were merely saying, "The war's in the bag—so let's relax!"

That attitude on the part of anyone—Government or management or labor—can lengthen this war. It can kill American boys.

Let us remember the lessons of 1918. In the summer of that year the tide turned in favor of the Allies. But this Government did not relax. In fact, our national effort was stepped up. In August, 1918, the draft age limits were broadened from 21-31 to 18-45. The President called for "force to the utmost," and his call was heeded. And in November, only three months later, Germany surrendered.

That is the way to fight and win a war—all out—and not with half-an-eye on the battlefronts abroad and the other eye-and-a-half on personal, selfish, or political interests here at home.

Therefore, in order to concentrate all our energies and resources on winning the war, and to maintain a fair and stable economy at home, I recommend that the Congress adopt:

1. A realistic tax law—which will tax all unreasonable profits, both individual and corporate, and reduce the ultimate cost of the war to our sons and daughters. The tax bill now under consideration by the Congress does not begin to meet this test.

2. A continuation of the law for the renegotiation of war contracts—which will prevent exorbitant profits and assure fair prices to the Government. For two long years I have pleaded with the Congress to take undue profits out of the war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. A cost of food law—which will enable the Government (a) to place a reasonable floor under the prices the farmer may expect for his production, and (b) to place a ceiling on the prices a consumer will have to pay for the food he buys. This should apply to necessities only; and will require public funds to carry out. It will cost in appropriations about 1 per cent of the present annual cost of the war.

4. Early enactment of the stabilization statute of October, 1942. This expires June 30, 1944, and if it is not extended well in advance the country might just as well expect price chaos by summer. We cannot have stabilization by wishful thinking. We must take positive action to maintain the integrity of the American dollar.

5. A national service law—which, for the duration of the war, will prevent strikes, and, with certain appropriate exceptions, will make available for war production or for any other essential services every able-bodied adult in the nation.

These five measures togther form a just and equitable whole. I would not recommend a national service law unless the other laws were also passed to keep down the cost of living, to share equitably the burdens of taxation, to hold the stabilization line, and to prevent undue profits.

The Federal Government already has the basic power to draft capital and property of all kinds for war purposes on a basis of just compensation.

As you know, I have for three years hesitated to recommend a national service act. Today, however, I am convinced of its necessity. Although I believe that we and our allies can win the war without such a measure, I am certain that nothing less than total mobilization of all our resources of manpower and capital will guarantee an earlier victory, and reduce the toll of suffering and sorrow and blood.

I have received a joint recommendation for this law from the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission. These are the men who bear responsibility for the procurement of the necessary arms and equipment, and for the successful prosecution of the war in the field. They say:

"When the very life of the nation is in peril the responsibiilty for service is common to all men and women. In such a time there can be no discrimination between the men and women who are assigned by the Government to its defense at the battle front and the men and women assigned to produce the vital materials essential to successful military operations. A prompt enactment of a national service law would be merely an expression of the universality of this responsibility."

I believe the country will agree that those statements are the solemn truth.

National service is the most democratic way to wage a war. Like selective service for the armed forces, it rests on the obligation of each citizen to serve his nation to his utmost where he is best qualified.

It does not mean reduction in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wages. It does not mean loss of retirement and seniority rights and benefits. It does not mean that any substantial numbers of war workers will be disturbed in their present jobs. Let these facts be wholly clear.

Experience in other democratic nations at war—Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand—has shown that the very existence of national service makes unnecessary the widespread use of compulsory power. National service has proved to be a unifying moral force—based on an equal and comprehensive legal obligation of all people in a nation at war.

There are millions of American men and women who are not in this war at all. It is not because they do not want to be in it. But they want to know where they can best do their share. National service provides that direction. It will be a means by which every man and woman can find that inner satisfaction which comes from making the fullest contribution to victory.

I know that all civilian workers will be glad to be able to say many years hence to their grandchildren: "Yes, I, too, was in service in the great war. I was on duty in an airplane factory, and I helped make hundreds of fighting planes. The Government told me that in doing that I was performing my most useful work in the service of my country."

It is argued that we have passed the stage in the war where national service is necessary. But our soldiers and sailors know that this is not true. We are going forward on a long, rough road—and, in all journeys, the last miles are the hardest. And it is for that final effort—for the total defeat of our enemies—that we must mobilize our total resources. The national war program calls for the employment of more people in 1944 than in 1943.

It is my conviction that the American people will welcome this win-the-war measure which is based on the eternally just principle of "Fair for one, fair for all."

It will give our people at home the assurance that they are standing four-square behind our soldiers and sailors. And it will give our enemies demoralizing assurance that we mean business—that we, 130,000,000 Americans, are on the march to Rome, Berlin and Tokyo.

I hope that the Congress will recognize that, although this is a political year, national service is an issue which transcends politics. Great power must be used for great purposes.

As to the machinery for this measure, the Congress itself should determine its nature—but it should be wholly non-partisan in its make-up.

Our armed forces are valiantly fulfilling their responsibilities to our country and our people. Now the Congress faces the responsibility for taking those measures which are essential to national security in this the most decisive phase of the nation's greatest war.

Several alleged reasons have prevented the enactment of legislation which would preserve for our soldiers and sailors and marines the fundamental prerogative of citizen-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship—the right to vote. No amount of legalistic argument can becloud this issue in the eyes of these 10,000,000 American citizens. Surely the signers of the Constitution did not intend a document which, even in wartime, would be construed to take away the franchise of any of those who are fighting to preserve the Constitution itself.

Our soldiers and sailors and marines know that the overwhelming majority of them will be deprived of the opportunity to vote if the voting machinery is left exclusively to the states under existing state laws—and that there is no likelihood of these laws being changed in time to enable them to vote at the next election. The Army and Navy have reported that it will be impossible effectively to administer forty-eight different soldier voting laws. It is the duty of the Congress to remove this unjustifiable discrimination against the men and women of our armed forces—and to do it as quickly as possible.

It is our duty now to begin to lay plans and determine the strategy for the winning of a lasting peace and the establishment of an American standard of living higher than ever before known. We cannot be content, no matter how high the general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and insecure.

This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights—among then the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures. They were our rights to life and liberty.

As our nation has grown in size and stature, however—as our industrial economy expanded—these political rights proved inadequate to assure us equality in the pursuit of happiness.

We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. "Necessitous men are not free men." People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made.

In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all, regardless of station, race or creed.

Among these are:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or the shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every business man, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

All of these rights spell security. And after this war is won we must be prepared to move forward, in the implementation of these rights, to new goals of human happiness and well-being.

America's own rightful place in the world depends in large part rights have been carried into prac- upon how fully these and similar tice for our citizens. For unless there is security here at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world.

One of the great American industrialists of our day—a man who has rendered yeoman service to his country in this crisis—recently emphasized the grave dangers of "rightist reaction" in this nation. All clear-thinking business men share his concern. Indeed, if such reaction should develop—if history were to repeat itself and we were to return to the so-called "normalcy" of the 1929's—then it is certain that even though we shall have conquered our enemies on the battlefields abroad, we shall have yielded to the spirit of fascism here at home.

I ask the Congress to explore the means for implementing this economic Bill of Rights, for it is definitely the responsibility of Congress so to do. Many of these problems are already before committees of the Congress in the form of proposed legislation. I shall from time to time communicate with the Congress with respect to these and further proposals. In the event that no adequate program of progress is evolved, I am certain that the nation will be conscious of the fact.

Our fighting men abroad, and their families at home, expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it. It is to their demands that this Government should pay heed, rather than to the whining demands of selfish pressure groups, who seek to feather their nests while young Americans are dying.

The foreign policy that we have been following—a policy that guided us to Moscow, Cairo and Teheran—is based on the common sense principle which was best expressed by Benjamin Franklin on July 4, 1776: "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

I have often said that there are no two fronts for America in this war. There is only one front. There is one line of duty, which extends from the hearts of the people at home to the men of our attacking forces in our farthest outposts. When we speak of our total effort we speak of the factory and the field and the mine as well as the battlefield—we speak of the soldier and the civilian, the citizen and his Government.

Each and every one of us has a solemn obligation under God to serve this nation in its most critical hour, to keep this nation great, to make this nation greater in a better world.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The White House, Jan. 11, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DECLARATION OF SOVIET GOVERNMENT ON SOVIET-POLISH RELATIONS

ON JANUARY 5 in London was published a declaration of the emigré Polish government on Soviet-Polish relations which contains a number of incorrect assertions, including an incorrect assertion about the Soviet-Polish frontier.

As is well known, the Soviet Constitution established the Soviet-Polish frontier in conformity with the will of the population of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia, as expressed through a plebiscite conducted on a broad democratic basis in 1939. Then the territories of the Western Ukraine in which Ukrainians form the overwhelming majority of the population were incorporated with the Soviet Ukraine, and the territories of Western Byelorussia in which Byelorussians form an overwhelming majority of the population were incorporated with Soviet Byelorussia. The injustice committed by the Riga Treaty of 1921, which was imposed upon the Soviet Union, in regard to the Ukrainians inhabiting the Western Ukraine and the Byelorussians inhabiting Western Byelorussia, was thus rectified.

The incorporation of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia with the Soviet Union not only did not violate the interests of Poland, but on the contrary created a reliable foundation for stable and permanent friendship between the Polish people and its neighbors—the Ukrainian and Byelorussian and Russian peoples.

The Soviet Government has repeatedly stated that it stands for the re-establishment of a strong and independent Poland and for friendship between the Soviet Union and Poland. The Soviet Government declares again that it seeks to establish friendship between the U.S.S.R. and Poland on the basis of stable, good-neighborly relations and mutual respect and, if the Polish people will so desire—on the basis of an alliance for mutual assistance against the Germans as the chief enemies of the Soviet Union and Poland.

Poland's joining of the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and post-war collaboration could contribute to the accomplishment of this task.

The successes scored by Soviet troops on the Soviet-German front daily accelerate the liberation of the occupied territories of the Soviet Union from the German invaders. The self-sacrificing struggle of the Red Army and the developing war operations of our Allies bring nearer the utter defeat of the Hitlerite war machine and are bringing to Poland and other nations liberation from the yoke of the German occupationists.

The Union of Polish Patriots in the U.S.S.R. and the Polish Army Corps formed by it, which acts on the front against the Germans hand-in-hand with the Red Army, are already fulfilling their glorious tasks in this struggle for liberation.

At present the possibility is opening for the rebirth of Poland as a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strong and independent state. However, Poland must be reborn not through the seizure of Ukrainian and Byelorussian lands, but through the restoration to Poland of lands which belonged to Poland from time immemorial and were wrested by the Germans from her. Only in this way trust and friendship could be established between the Polish, Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Russian peoples..

The eastern frontiers of Poland can be established by agreement with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government does not regard the frontiers of 1939 as unalterable. These frontiers can be modified in Poland's favor so that the areas in which the Polish population forms a majority be turned over to Poland. In this case the Soviet-Polish frontier could pass approximately along the so-called Curzon line, which was adopted in 1919 by the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers, and which provides for inclusion of the Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia into the Soviet Union.

The western frontiers of Poland must be extended through incorporation with Poland of ancient Polish lands previously wrested by Germany, without which it is impossible to unite the whole Polish people in its state, which thereby will receive a needed outlet to the Baltic Sea.

The just aspiration of the Polish people for its full reunion in a strong and independent state must receive recognition and support.

The emigré Polish government, isolated from its people, proved incapable of establishment of friendly relations with the Soviet Union. It also proved incapable of organizing active struggle against the German invaders within Poland herself. Furthermore, by its incorrect policy it not infrequently plays into the hands of the German occupationists.

However, the interests of Poland and the Soviet Union consist in that stable, friendly relations be established between our countries and that the people of Poland and the Soviet Union unite in struggle against the common external enemy, as demanded by the common cause of all the Allies.

SOVIET STATEMENT ON POLAND

IN REPLY to a declaration made by the Polish government in London, January 15, Tass is authorized to state:

First, in the Polish declaration the question of the recognition of the Curzon Line as a Soviet-Polish frontier is entirely evaded and ignored, which can only be interpreted as a rejection of the Curzon Line.

Secondly, as regards the Polish government's proposal for the opening of official negotiations between it and the Soviet government, the Soviet government is of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the opinion this proposal aims at misleading public opinion, for it is easy to understand that the Soviet government is not in a position to enter into official negotiations with a government with which diplomatic relations have been broken.

Soviet circles wish that it should be borne in mind that diplomatic relations with the Polish government were broken off through the fault of that government because of its active participation in the hostile anti-Soviet slanderous campaign of the German invaders in connection with the alleged murders in Katyn.

In the opinion of the Soviet circles, the above-mentioned circumstances once again demonstrate that the present Polish government does not desire to establish good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

THE POPULIST MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

By Anna Rochester

An illuminating study of the origins and economic background of the Populist movement, and its historic significance as one of the first anti-monopoly coalitions in the United States. **Price $.35**

LABOR PARTIES: 1827-1834

By Alden Whitman

A new study of labor's initial steps in independent political action during the formative years of workers' organizations in the United States. **Price $.25**

WENDELL PHILLIPS

By James J. Green

An evaluation of the life and work of the great Abolitionist leader who distinguished himself in the fight for Negro emancipation, free education, women's rights, universal suffrage and other progressive causes. **Price $.15**

THOMAS JEFFERSON: SELECTIONS FROM HIS WRITINGS

Jefferson's writings on democracy, slavery, education, world affairs, etc., arranged and with an essay on his life and work by Dr. Philip Foner. **Price $.25**

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second Printing—Total 185,000 copies—

The Secret of Soviet Strength

By HEWLETT JOHNSON

Dean of Canterbury

Millions of American readers who were thrilled by the Dean of Canterbury's great work, **The Soviet Power,** of which more than two million copies were sold in the U.S.A., will hail this new book by England's distinguished Church leader.

The Secret of Soviet Strength takes the reader behind the scenes to reveal the challenge and sources of the political, economic and military might of the U.S.S.R. which today, on the Eastern Front, is rolling up a magnificent record of smashing victories, unprecedented in the annals of military history.

This book tells you how and why these achievements of our Soviet ally are made possible. It describes in human and dramatic terms the Soviet system and how it works, Soviet morale and its wellsprings, Soviet leadership and its roots in the love of the people.

Price 35 cents

"Three for a dollar"

Cloth Edition $1.50

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED